arXiv:1602.01892v1 [math.AP] 5 Feb 2016

TWO DIMENSIONAL SUPERSONIC SOLUTIONS FOR THE STEADY EULER-POISSON SYSTEM IN A BOUNDED DOMAIN

MYOUNGJEAN BAE, BEN DUAN, JINGJING XIAO, AND CHUNJING XIE

Abstract. We establish the unique existence and stability of supersonic flow for steady Euler-Poisson system in a two dimensional rectangular domain when prescribing pressure, incoming flow angles, and normal electric field at the entrance. With the aid of Helmholtz decomposition for the velocity field, the supersonic flows of the Euler-Poisson system are obtained as solutions to a nonlinear system consisting of a second order hyperbolic-elliptic coupled system and several transport equations. The new feature of this work is that we achieve the well-posedness of a boundary value problem associated with a coupled system consisting of two second order quasilinear equations, where one equation is hyperbolic and the other is elliptic, via a deliberate choice of multiplier to gain energy estimate.

1. Introduction and main results

The Euler-Poisson system

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + \mathrm{div}_{\mathrm{x}}(\rho\mathbf{u}) = 0, \\ (\rho\mathbf{u})_t + \mathrm{div}_{\mathrm{x}}(\rho\mathbf{u}\otimes\mathbf{u} + p\mathbf{I}_n) = \rho\nabla_{\mathrm{x}}\Phi, \\ (\rho\mathcal{E})_t + \mathrm{div}_{\mathrm{x}}(\rho\mathcal{E}\mathbf{u} + p\mathbf{u}) = \rho\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla_{\mathrm{x}}\Phi, \\ \Delta_{\mathrm{x}}\Phi = \rho - b(\mathrm{x}), \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

models various physical phenomena including the propagation of electrons in submicron semiconductor devices and plasmas [25], and the biological transport of ions for channel proteins [6]. In the hydrodynamical model of semiconductor devices or plasmas, $\mathbf{u}, \rho$, p, and $\mathcal{E}$ represent the macroscopic particle velocity, electron density, pressure, and the total energy density, respectively. The electric potential Φ is generated by the Coulomb force of particles. $\mathbf{I}_n$ is the $n\times n$ identity matrix and $b(\mathrm{x}) > 0$ stands for the density of fixed, positively charged background ions. The system (1.1) is closed with the aid of definition of specific total energy and the equation of state

$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{|\mathbf{u}|^2}{2} + \mathfrak{e} \quad \text{and} \quad p = p(\rho, \mathfrak{e}), \tag{1.2}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J47, 35J57, 35J66, 35M10, 76N10.
Key words and phrases. Euler-Poisson system, supersonic flow, existence, stability, Helmholtz decomposition, vorticity, hyperbolic-elliptic coupled system.

respectively, where $\mathfrak{e}$ is the internal energy. In this paper, we consider ideal polytropic gas for which the pressure p and *the enthalpy* $\mathfrak{i} = \mathfrak{e} + \frac{p}{\rho}$ are given by

$$p(\rho, S) = e^S \rho^\gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{i}(\rho, S) = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma - 1} \rho^{\gamma - 1} e^S, \tag{1.3}$$

respectively, where $\gamma > 1$ is called the adiabatic exponent and $S > 0$ represents entropy.

Our ultimate goal is to analyze stability of multidimensional transonic solutions for the Euler-Poisson system. In order to build a footstone toward the goal, we investigate the steady supersonic solutions for the Euler-Poisson system. In the two dimensional case, let u and v denote the horizontal and vertical components of the velocity $\mathbf{u}$. Then, the steady Euler-Poisson system is written as

$$\begin{cases} (\rho u)_{x_1} + (\rho v)_{x_2} = 0, \\ (\rho u^2 + p)_{x_1} + (\rho uv)_{x_2} = \rho \Phi_{x_1}, \\ (\rho uv)_{x_1} + (\rho v^2 + p)_{x_2} = \rho \Phi_{x_2}, \\ (\rho u \mathscr{B})_{x_1} + (\rho v \mathscr{B})_{x_2} = \rho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \Phi, \\ \Delta \Phi = \rho - b(\mathrm{x}) \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

for $\mathrm{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ where the Bernoulli's function $\mathscr{B}$ is given by

$$\mathscr{B}(\rho, \mathbf{u}, S) = \frac{|\mathbf{u}|^2}{2} + \mathfrak{e} + \frac{p}{\rho} = \frac{|\mathbf{u}|^2}{2} + \frac{\gamma}{\gamma - 1} \rho^{\gamma - 1} e^S. \tag{1.5}$$

The results in this paper hold for general equation of states. But for ease of presentation in the rest of the paper, we only focus on the polytropic case with a fixed adiabatic exponent $\gamma > 1$.

The system (1.4) changes its type when the flow speed varies from subsonic ($|\mathbf{u}| < \sqrt{p_\rho(\rho, S)}$) to supersonic ($|\mathbf{u}| > \sqrt{p_\rho(\rho, S)}$). There have been a few studies on transonic solutions of the Euler-Poisson system(cf.[1, 11, 12, 22, 23, 28]). The one dimensional transonic shock solutions and their structural stability and dynamical stability in one dimensional setting have been achieved in [22, 23]. The results in [22, 23] reveal that the effect of electric force in the Euler-Poisson system has similar physical effect as the geometry of divergent domain in the Euler system. Recently, there are extensive studies on the structural stability of transonic shock solutions of the Euler system, see [5, 7, 8, 19, 31] and references therein. However, the stability problems of transonic shock solutions of the multidimensional Euler-Poisson system are essentially open because the Poisson equation for the electric potential makes the fluid variables in the Euler-Poisson system coupled in a nonlocal and nonlinear way. Therefore, the multidimensional Euler-Poisson system is worthy of studying not only physically but also mathematically.

Prior to investigation on the stability of multidimensional transonic solutions for the Euler-Poisson system, the unique existence and stability of subsonic solutions and supersonic solutions for steady Euler-Poisson system must be established first.

To our knowledge, the first result about structural stability of multidimensional subsonic solutions with large variations for the Euler-Poisson system under perturbations of exit pressure was given in [2]. Later on, the stability of subsonic solutions for the two dimensional Euler-Poisson system with non-zero vorticity was established in [3] with the aid of Helmholtz decomposition for the velocity field and careful estimate for the transport equations. Similar results are obtained in [4] for two dimensional Euler-Poisson system for self-gravitating flows via stream function formulation. The subsonic solutions for the Euler-Poisson system were also studied in [9, 10, 15, 24, 32, 33, 30] and references therein.

In this paper, we investigate supersonic solutions for the Euler-Poisson system. The one dimensional supersonic solutions for the Euler-Poisson system were studied in [26, 23]. So far, we have not found any known result on multidimensional supersonic solutions for the Euler-Poisson system.

Our goal in this paper is to prove unique existence and stability of supersonic solutions to the steady Euler-Poisson system in two dimensional nozzle of finite length under perturbations of boundary data. For the general supersonic flows with non-zero vorticity, we apply the method of Helmholtz decomposition to write the steady Euler-Poisson system as a second order quasi-linear hyperbolic-elliptic coupled system and two homogeneous transport equations. The most important part of the analysis is to achieve well-posedness of a nonlinear boundary value problem for a second order hyperbolic-elliptic coupled system. The key ingredient of this paper is to establish H^1 a priori estimate of solutions to a class of second order hyperbolic-elliptic coupled systems by finding a proper multiplier.

In forthcoming works, we will combine the result in this paper with the results from [2, 3] to investigate structural stability of multidimensional transonic shock solutions for the steady Euler-Poisson system. For other studies on the Euler-Poisson system with relaxations, one may see [21, 18, 17, 15] and the references therein.

1.1. **One dimensional solutions.** Let b_0 be a fixed constant. Assume that (ρ, u, p, Φ) solves the ODE system

$$\begin{cases} (\rho u)' = 0, \\ (\rho u^2 + p)' = \rho \Phi', \\ (\rho u \mathscr{B})' = \rho u \Phi', \\ \Phi'' = \rho - b_0, \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

where $'$ denotes the derivative with respect to x_1 and $\mathscr{B} = \mathscr{B}(\rho, (u, 0), S)$ is defined in (1.5). If, in addition, $\rho > 0$ and $u > 0$, then the ODE system (1.6) is equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \rho' = \frac{E\rho}{\gamma e^{S_0}\rho^{\gamma-1} - \frac{J_0^2}{\rho^2}}, \\ E' = \rho - b_0 \end{cases} \tag{1.7}$$

with

$$u = \frac{J_0}{\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad S = S_0, \tag{1.8}$$

where the constants $J_0 > 0$ and $S_0 > 0$ are determined by their values at $x_1 = 0$, and $E = \Phi'$ is called the electric field. Denote

$$\mathscr{S}_0 = e^{S_0} \quad \text{and} \quad m_0 = J_0 \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} > 0. \tag{1.9}$$

Hence the system (1.7) can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \rho' = \frac{E\rho}{\gamma \mathscr{S}_0 \rho^{\gamma-1} - \rho^{-2} m_0^2 \mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}}, \\ E' = \rho - b_0. \end{cases} \tag{1.10}$$

The first equation in (1.10) has a singularity at $\rho = \rho_s$ where

$$\rho_s = \left(\frac{m_0^2}{\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}} \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{-1}{\gamma-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad u_s = J/\rho_s = (\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1})^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}. \tag{1.11}$$

The system (1.10) is a Hamiltonian system. Any C^1 solution (ρ, E) to (1.10) satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2}E^2 - H(\rho) = \text{constant} \tag{1.12}$$

where

$$H(\rho) = \int_{\rho_s}^{\rho} \frac{(t - b_0)}{t} \left(\gamma \mathscr{S}_0 t^{\gamma-1} - \frac{m_0^2 \mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}}{t^2} \right) dt. \tag{1.13}$$

In this paper, we assume that

$$0 < b_0 < \rho_s. \tag{1.14}$$

Under the assumption of (1.14), a phase plane of the system (1.10) is as in Figure 1 for any $(m_0, b_0, \mathscr{S}_0) \in (0, \infty)^3$.



FIGURE 1. Phase plane of the system (1.10)

Substituting $\rho = m_0 \mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \frac{1}{u}$ into (1.10) yields an equivalent system (1.10) for (u, E) as follows,

$$\begin{cases} u' = \frac{uE}{u^2 - \frac{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}}{u^{\gamma-1}}}, \\ E' = m_0 \mathscr{S}_0^{-1/(\gamma-1)} \frac{1}{u} - b_0. \end{cases} \tag{1.15}$$

Proposition 1.1. *Given any constants $L > 0$, $m_0 > 0$, and $\mathscr{S}_0 > 1$, there exists a nonempty parameter set $\mathfrak{P}(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0) \subset (0, \rho_s) \times ((\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1})^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}, \infty) \times (0, \infty)$ so that for any $(b_0, u_0, E_0) \in \mathfrak{P}(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$, the initial value problem for the system (1.15) with the initial condition*

$$(u, E)(0) = (u_0, E_0) \tag{1.16}$$

has a unique smooth solution on $(0, L)$, which satisfies

$$u(x_1) > (\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1})^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad E(x_1) > 0 \qquad \text{for all } x_1 \in [0, L]. \tag{1.17}$$

Furthermore, there exists a constant $\underline{E}_0 > 0$ depending only on (L, m_0) so that the parameter set $\mathfrak{P}(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$ contains $(0, \rho_s) \times ((\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1})^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}, \infty) \times [\underline{E}_0, \infty)$.

Proof. Given any $u_0 > 0$, set

$$\rho_0 = \frac{m_0 \mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}}{u_0}.$$

It is easy to see that $u_0 > u_s$ if and only if $\rho_0 < \rho_s$ where ρ_s and u_s are defined in (1.11). For fixed $(b_0, u_0, E_0) \in (0, \rho_s) \times ((\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1})^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}, \infty) \times (0, \infty)$, consider the initial value problem (1.15)-(1.16). This problem has a unique C^1 solution on $(0, L)$ if and only if there exists a

unique C^1 solution on $(0, L)$ for the system (1.10) with the initial condition

$$(\rho, E)(0) = (\rho_0, E_0). \tag{1.18}$$

Furthermore, the property (1.17) holds if and only if (ρ, E) satisfy

$$\rho(x) < \rho_s \qquad \text{and} \qquad E(x) > 0 \qquad \text{for all } x \in [0, L]. \tag{1.19}$$

Therefore, it suffices to prove that there exists a nonempty parameter set $\mathfrak{P}_*(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0) \subset (0, \rho_s)^2 \times (0, \infty)$ so that for each $(b_0, \rho_0, E_0) \in \mathfrak{P}_*(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$, the initial value problem (1.10) and (1.18) has a unique solution on $(0, L)$ satisfying (1.19).

Fix $(b_0, \rho_0, E_0) \in (0, \rho_s)^2 \times (0, \infty)$. Let $(\rho, E)(x_1; \rho_0, E_0)$ be the solution to the problem (1.10) and (1.18). It is easy to see from (1.10) that $\rho(x_1; b_0, E_0)$ decreases with respect to x_1 when x_1 is small. Furthermore, one can see from Figure 1 that there exists a unique $(\rho^\sharp, x_1^\sharp) \in (0, b_0) \times (0, \infty)$ satisfying

$$H(\rho^\sharp) = H(b_0) - \frac{1}{2}E_0^2, \qquad (\rho, E)(x_1^\sharp; b_0, E_0) = (\rho^\sharp, 0), \tag{1.20}$$

$$\rho^\sharp < \rho(x_1; b_0, E_0) < b_0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < E(x_1; b_0, E_0) < E_0 \qquad \text{for } 0 < x_1 < x_1^\sharp.$$

Integrating the first equation in (1.10) yields

$$\int_{b_0}^{\rho^\sharp} \frac{1}{\rho}\left(\gamma \mathscr{S}_0 \rho^{\gamma-1} - \rho^{-2} m_0^2 \mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}\right) d\rho = \int_0^{x_1^\sharp} E(x_1; b_0, E_0) dx_1 \le E_0 x_1^\sharp.$$

Therefore, one has

$$x_1^\sharp \ge \frac{m_0^2 \mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}}{2E_0}\left(\frac{1}{(\rho^\sharp)^2} - \frac{1}{b_0^2}\right) - \frac{\gamma \mathscr{S}_0}{(\gamma-1)E_0} b_0^{\gamma-1}. \tag{1.21}$$

Using (1.11), (1.14), and (1.20) gives

$$\frac{m_0^2 \mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{2}{\gamma-1}}}{2E_0}\left(\frac{1}{(\rho^\sharp)^2} - \frac{1}{b_0^2}\right) \ge \frac{E_0}{2b_0} - \mathscr{S}_0 b_0^{\gamma-1}. \tag{1.22}$$

It follows from (1.21) and (1.22) that one has

$$x_1^\sharp \ge \frac{E_0}{2b_0} - \frac{(2\gamma-1)}{\gamma-1}\frac{\mathscr{S}_0 b_0^{\gamma-1}}{E_0}. \tag{1.23}$$

Note that $\mathscr{S}_0 > 1$. With the aid of (1.11) and (1.14), the estimate (1.23) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} x_1^\sharp \ge & \frac{E_0}{\rho_s} - \frac{2\gamma-1}{\gamma-1}\frac{\mathscr{S}_0 \rho_s^{\gamma-1}}{E_0} \\ \ge & \frac{E_0}{2}\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\left(\frac{\gamma}{m_0^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}} - \frac{(2\gamma-1)}{(\gamma-1)E_0}\left(\frac{m_0^2}{\gamma}\right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$x_1^\sharp \geq \frac{E_0}{2}\left(\frac{\gamma}{m_0^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}} - \frac{(2\gamma-1)}{(\gamma-1)E_0}\left(\frac{m_0^2}{\gamma}\right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma+1}} =: \Upsilon(E_0, m_0).$$

Since $\Upsilon(E_0, m_0)$ is an increasing function of E_0, one can choose $\underline{E}_0 > 0$ to satisfy $\Upsilon(\underline{E}_0, m_0) > L$ so that $\bar{x}_1^\sharp > L$ holds whenever $E_0 \geq \underline{E}_0$. Therefore, if $\rho_0 > b_0$ and $E_0 > \underline{E}_0$, then the lifespan of the solution must be larger than L. This finishes the proof of the proposition. □

The following two propositions for the properties of one dimensional supersonic solutions play important roles for our main results.

Proposition 1.2. *Fix constants $L > 0$, $m_0 > 0$, and $\mathscr{S}_0 > 1$. Given a fixed $(b_0, u_0, E_0) \in \mathfrak{P}(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$, let (u, E) be the solution to the initial value problem (1.15)-(1.16). Then, there exists a constant $U_0 > 0$ depending only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0) so that (u, E) satisfy*

$$u_0 \leq u(x_1) \leq U_0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < E(x_1) \leq U_0 \quad \text{for } x_1 \in [0, L]. \tag{1.24}$$

Furthermore, the constant U_0 is independent of $\mathscr{S}_0 > 1$.

Proof. It follows from (1.12) and (1.13) that one has

$$\begin{aligned} E^2 &= 2\left(H\left(\frac{J_0}{u}\right) - H\left(\frac{J_0}{u_0}\right)\right) + E_0^2 \\ &\leq E_0^2 + 2J_0(u - u_0) + \frac{2b_0\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}}{\gamma-1}\left(\frac{1}{u_0^{\gamma-1}} - \frac{1}{u^{\gamma-1}}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{1.25}$$

where the property $u' > 0$ on $(0, L)$ has been used. Combining (1.9), (1.11), (1.14) and the condition $\rho_0 < \rho_s$ yields

$$J_0 < m_0, \quad b_0 < \left(\frac{m_0^2}{\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}, \quad \text{and } \frac{1}{u_0^{\gamma-1}} < (\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1})^{-\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma+1}}.$$

These, together with (1.25), give

$$E^2 \leq E_0^2 + 2m_0 u + 2\frac{\gamma^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}}{\gamma-1} m_0^{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma+1}}.$$

Therefore, one has

$$E \leq \sqrt{2m_0 u} + \mu_0, \quad \text{where} \quad \mu_0 = E_0 + m_0^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+1}}\sqrt{\frac{2\gamma^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma+1)}}}{\gamma-1}}. \tag{1.26}$$

Substituting (1.26) into the first equation in (1.15) and noting that $u^2 - \frac{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}}{u^{\gamma-1}} > 0$ give

$$\frac{u^2 - \frac{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}}{u^{\gamma-1}}}{u(\sqrt{2m_0 u} + \mu_0)} u' \leq 1 \quad \text{on} \quad (0, L). \tag{1.27}$$

If $\max_{x_1\in[0,L]} u \le \max\{2u_0, \frac{\mu_0^2}{2m_0}\}$, then the first inequality in (1.24) holds. Suppose that $\max_{x_1\in[0,L]} u > \max\{2u_0, \frac{\mu_0^2}{2m_0}\}$. Since $u' > 0$ on $(0, L)$, there exists $x_1^* \in (0, L)$ such that

$$u(x_1^*) = \max\left\{2u_0, \frac{\mu_0^2}{2m_0}\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad u(x_1) > \max\left\{2u_0, \frac{\mu_0^2}{2m_0}\right\} \quad \text{for } x_1^* < x_1 \le L.$$

Thus it follows from (1.27) that we get

$$\int_{u(x_1^*)}^{u(L)} u^{\frac{1}{2}} - \gamma m_0^{\gamma-1} u^{-(\gamma+\frac{1}{2})}\, du \le 2\sqrt{2m_0}L.$$

Hence one has

$$\frac{2}{3}((u(L))^{\frac{3}{2}} - (u(x_1^*))^{\frac{3}{2}}) \le 2\sqrt{2m_0}L + \frac{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}}{(\gamma-\frac{1}{2})u_0^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Therefore, we can find a constant $U_0 > 0$ depending only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0) so that the first inequality of (1.24) holds. The second inequality of (1.24) is obtained from (1.26) with U_0 being adjusted if necessary. This finishes the proof of the proposition. □

In the rest of paper, we assume that L and m_0 are fixed positive constants unless otherwise specified.

Proposition 1.3. *Given $E_0 > 0$, there exists a constant $\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0 > 1$ depending only on (L, m_0, E_0) so that if $(b_0, u_0, E_0) \in \mathfrak{P}(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$ with $\mathscr{S}_0 \ge \underline{\mathscr{S}}_0$, then the unique solution (u, E) to the problem (1.15)-(1.16) on the interval $(0, L)$ satisfies*

$$\min_{x_1\in[0,L]} E(x_1) \ge \frac{E_0}{2}.$$

If, in addition, $E_0 \ge \kappa_0$ for some constant $\kappa_0 > 0$, then $\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0 > 1$ can be chosen depending only on (L, m_0, κ_0).

Proof. By Proposition 1.2, we obtain from (1.7) and (1.14) that

$$E(x_1) = E_0 - b_0x_1 + \int_0^{x_1} \rho(s)ds \ge E_0 - b_0x_1 \ge E_0 - x_1\mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\left(\frac{m_0^2}{\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}.$$

Hence one has

$$\min_{x_1\in[0,L]} E(x_1) \ge E_0 - L\mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\left(\frac{m_0^2}{\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma+1}}. \tag{1.28}$$

Therefore, there exists a constant $\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0 (= e^{\underline{S}_0}) > 1$ depending only on (L, m_0, E_0) so that the estimate (1.28) implies

$$\min_{x_1\in[0,L]} E(x_1) \ge \frac{E_0}{2}.$$

It can be easily checked from (1.28) that if $E_0 \geq \kappa_0$ for some constant $\kappa_0 > 0$, then $\underline{\mathscr{L}}_0 > 1$ can be chosen depending only on (L, m_0, κ_0). □

1.2. **Main Theorem.** Define a two dimensional flat duct by $\Omega := (0, L) \times (-1, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. The boundary $\partial\Omega$ of Ω consists of the entrance $\Gamma_0 = \{0\} \times [-1, 1]$, the exit $\Gamma_L = \{L\} \times [-1, 1]$, and the insulated boundary $\Lambda = (0, L) \times \{\pm 1\}$.

If $(\rho, u, v, p, \Phi) \in [C^1(\Omega)]^4 \times C^2(\Omega)$ solves (1.4), then it holds that

$$\rho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla S = 0, \quad \rho \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla(\mathscr{B} - \Phi) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega.$$

We call

$$\mathscr{K} := \mathscr{B} - \Phi$$

a *pseudo-Bernoulli's invariant*. In this paper, we assume that $\mathscr{K}$ is a constant on Γ_0 for simplicity. Even if $\mathscr{K}$ is not a constant on Γ_0, the result of this paper still holds true. It can be checked by adjusting the argument of this paper with minor changes.

If $\mathscr{K} = \mathscr{K}_0$ on Γ_0 for a constant $\mathscr{K}_0$, and if $\rho \geq \underline{\rho}$ and $u \geq \underline{u}$ hold in $\overline{\Omega}$ for some positive constants $\underline{\rho}$ and $\underline{u}$, then $\mathscr{K}$ is a constant in $\overline{\Omega}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that

$$\mathscr{K} \equiv 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \overline{\Omega}. \tag{1.29}$$

Our goal of this paper is to solve the problem stated below.

Problem 1.4. *Given functions* $(b, \omega_{en}, p_{en}, \rho_{en}, E_{en}, \Phi_{ex})$, *find* $(\rho, u, v, p, \Phi) \in [C^1(\Omega) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega})]^4 \times [C^2(\Omega) \cap C^1(\overline{\Omega})]$ *so that*

(i) (ρ, u, v, p, Φ) *satisfy* (1.4) *and* (1.29) *in* Ω;
(ii) $\rho > 0$ *and* $u > 0$ *hold in* $\overline{\Omega}$;
(iii) (ρ, u, v, p, Φ) *satisfy boundary conditions:*

$$(\rho, \frac{v}{u}, p, \Phi_x) = (\rho_{en}, \omega_{en}, p_{en}, E_{en}) \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_0, \tag{1.30}$$

$$v = \Phi_{x_2} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Lambda, \tag{1.31}$$

$$\Phi = \Phi_{ex} \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_L; \tag{1.32}$$

(iv) *the inequality* $u^2 + v^2 > \frac{\gamma p}{\rho}$ *holds in* $\overline{\Omega}$, *i.e., the flow corresponding to* (ρ, u, v, p, Φ) *is supersonic in* Ω.

Definition 1.5 (Background solution)**.** *For* $(b_0, u_0, E_0) \in \mathfrak{P}(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$, *let* $(\bar{u}, \bar{E})$ *be a unique solution to the problem* (1.15)-(1.16). *We call such a triple* $(\bar{u}, \bar{E}, \mathscr{S}_0)$ a background supersonic solution corresponding to (b_0, u_0, E_0).

In the rest of the paper, we assume that given functions $(\rho_{en}, p_{en}, \omega_{en}, E_{en}, b) \in [C^4([-1,1])]^4 \times C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfy the following compatibility conditions

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_{x_2} b(\mathrm{x}) = 0 \ \text{ for } \ \mathrm{x} \in \bar{\Lambda}, \\ &\frac{d^k}{dx_2^k}(\mathscr{S}_{en}, p_{en}, E_{en})(\pm 1) = \frac{d^{k-1}}{dx_2^{k-1}}\omega_{en}(\pm 1) = 0 \ \text{ for } \ k = 1, 3, \ \text{where } \mathscr{S}_{en} = p_{en}/\rho_{en}^{\gamma}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.33}$$

We also denote

$$\begin{aligned} &\sigma_1 := \|p_{en} - p_0\|_{C^4([-1,1])} + \|\omega_{en}\|_{C^4([-1,1])} \quad \text{with} \quad p_0 = \mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \frac{m_0^{\gamma}}{u_0^{\gamma}}, \\ &\sigma_2 := \|\mathscr{S}_{en} - \mathscr{S}_0\|_{C^4([-1,1])} + \|E_{en} - E_0\|_{C^4([-1,1])} + \|b - b_0\|_{C^2(\overline{\Omega})}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.34}$$

Theorem 1.6. *Given constants $u_0 \in (u_s, \infty)$ and $E_0 > 0$, there exists a constant $\underline{\mathscr{L}}_0 > 1$ depending only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0) so that if $(\bar{u}, \bar{E}, \mathscr{S}_0)$ is a background supersonic solution corresponding to $(b_0, u_0, E_0) \in \mathfrak{P}(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$ with $\mathscr{S}_0 \geq \underline{\mathscr{L}}_0$, then there exist two positive constants $\bar{\sigma}_1$ and $\bar{\sigma}_2$ depending on $(L, m_0, u_0, E_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$ such that if $\sigma_1 \leq \bar{\sigma}_1$ and $\sigma_2 \leq \bar{\sigma}_2$ with σ_1 and σ_2 defined in* (1.34)*, then Problem 1.4 has a solution $(\rho, u, v, \mathscr{S}, \Phi) \in [C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \cap H^3(\Omega)]^3 \times [C^1(\Omega) \cap H^4(\Omega)] \times [C^2(\overline{\Omega}) \cap H^4(\Omega)]$ satisfying*

$$\|(u, v) - (\bar{u}, 0)\|_{H^3(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \|\Phi - \Phi_0\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \leq C\left((\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} + \mathscr{S}_0)\sigma_1 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\sigma_2\right), \tag{1.35}$$

$$\|\mathscr{S} - \mathscr{S}_0\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \leq C\sigma_2, \tag{1.36}$$

where the positive constant C depends only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0). Furthermore, such a solution is unique.

Remark 1.7. *The estimate of $\|\rho - \bar{\rho}\|_{H^3(\Omega)}$ can be directly obtained from* (1.29) *and* (1.35)-(1.36)*.*

The rest of paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to reformulate Problem 1.4 via the Helmholtz decomposition. The Euler-Poisson system can be reformulated into three second order equations together with two transport equations. In order to capture the major difficulty, we first formulate a simplified problem for the hyperbolic-elliptic coupled system which corresponds to isentropic irrotational solutions of the Euler-Poisson system. In Section 3, we establish the well-posedness of a linear hyperbolic-elliptic coupled system associated with the isentropic irrotational flows for the Euler-Poisson system in the nozzle via weighted energy estimate and Galerkin's method. Based on these preparations, the stability of supersonic irrotational solutions for the Euler-Poisson system is proved via a fixed point argument in Section 4. Our main theorem on the stability of supersonic solution for the Euler-Poisson system with nonzero vorticity is established in Section 5.

2. Reformulation of the problem

2.1. **Helmholtz decomposition.** As same as [4], we introduce the Helmholtz decomposition for the velocity field. Given a velocity field $\mathbf{u} \in C^1(\Omega) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega})$, define curl $\mathbf{u} = \partial_{x_2} u - \partial_{x_1} v$. If $\phi \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\phi = \text{curl } \mathbf{u} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_{x_1}\phi = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_0, \qquad \phi = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_0, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

then $\text{curl}(\mathbf{u} - \nabla^\perp\phi) = 0$ holds in Ω where $\nabla^\perp\phi := (\partial_{x_2}\phi, -\partial_{x_1}\phi)$. Since Ω is a simply connected domain, one can find a function $\varphi \in C^2(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$\nabla\varphi = \mathbf{u} - \nabla^\perp\phi.$$

In terms of (ϕ, φ), the velocity field $\mathbf{u}$ can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{u} = \nabla\varphi + \nabla^\perp\phi. \tag{2.2}$$

Using (1.29) and (2.2), we rewrite the system (1.4) as a nonlinear system for $(\varphi, \phi, \Phi, \mathscr{S})$:

$$\text{div}\left(\mathcal{H}\left(\mathscr{S}, \Phi - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\varphi + \nabla^\perp\phi|^2\right)(\nabla\varphi + \nabla^\perp\phi)\right) = 0, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\Delta\Phi = \mathcal{H}\left(\mathscr{S}, \Phi - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\varphi + \nabla^\perp\phi|^2\right) - b, \tag{2.4}$$

$$\Delta\phi = -\frac{\mathcal{H}^{\gamma-1}\left(\mathscr{S}, \Phi - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\varphi + \nabla^\perp\phi|^2\right)\mathscr{S}_{x_2}}{(\gamma-1)(\varphi_{x_1} + \phi_{x_2})}, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\mathcal{H}\left(\mathscr{S}, \Phi - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\varphi + \nabla^\perp\phi|^2\right)(\nabla\varphi + \nabla^\perp\phi)\cdot\nabla\mathscr{S} = 0, \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathscr{S}, \zeta) = \left(\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}\frac{\zeta}{\mathscr{S}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \quad \text{provided that } \frac{\zeta}{\mathscr{S}} > 0. \tag{2.7}$$

Set

$$u_{en}(x_2, z) := \sqrt{\frac{2}{1 + \omega_{en}^2(x_2)}\Big(z - \mathfrak{i}(\rho_{en}(x_2), \ln\mathscr{S}_{en}(x_2))\Big)} \tag{2.8}$$

with $\mathfrak{i}(\rho, S)$ defined by (1.3). The boundary conditions for $(\varphi, \phi, \Phi, \mathscr{S})$ corresponding to (1.30)–(1.32) are given as follows.

$$\varphi_{x_1} = u_{en}(x_2, \Phi(0, x_2)) - \phi_{x_2},\ \varphi(0, x_2) = \varphi_{en}(x_2; \Phi) \text{ on } \Gamma_0, \quad \varphi_{x_2} = 0 \text{ on } \Lambda, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\Phi_{x_1} = E_{en} \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_0, \quad \Phi_{x_2} = 0 \text{ on } \quad \Lambda, \quad \Phi = \Phi_{ex} \text{ on } \quad \Gamma_L, \tag{2.10}$$

$$\phi_{x_1} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_0, \quad \phi = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_0, \tag{2.11}$$

$$\mathscr{S} = \mathscr{S}_{en} \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_0, \tag{2.12}$$

where

$$\varphi_{en}(x_2; \Phi) = \int_{-1}^{x_2} u_{en}(s, \Phi(0, s))\omega_{en}(s)\, ds.$$

Given $(b_0, u_0, E_0) \in \mathfrak{P}(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$, let $(\bar{u}, \bar{E}, \mathscr{S}_0)$ be the background supersonic solution corresponding to (b_0, u_0, E_0). For $\mathrm{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega$, define

$$\varphi_0(\mathrm{x}) = \int_0^{x_1} \bar{u}(t)\, dt \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_0(\mathrm{x}) = \int_0^{x_1} \bar{E}(t)\, dt + \mathscr{B}_0 \tag{2.13}$$

with $\mathscr{B}_0 = \frac{1}{2}u_0^2 + \frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}\frac{m_0^{\gamma-1}}{u_0^{\gamma-1}}$. Note that Φ_0 satisfies $\bar{\mathscr{B}} - \Phi_0 \equiv 0$ in Ω for $\bar{\mathscr{B}} = \mathscr{B}(\bar{\rho}, \bar{u}, 0, \ln \mathscr{S}_0)$ given by (1.5).

Theorem 1.6 directly follows from the theorem stated below.

Theorem 2.1. *Given constants $u_0 \in (u_s, \infty)$ and $E_0 > 0$, there exists a constant $\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0 > 1$ depending only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0) so that if $(\bar{u}, \bar{E}, \mathscr{S}_0)$ is a background supersonic solution corresponding to $(b_0, u_0, E_0) \in \mathfrak{P}(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$ with $\mathscr{S}_0 \geq \underline{\mathscr{S}}_0$, then there exist two positive constants $\bar{\sigma}_1$ and $\bar{\sigma}_2$ depending on $(L, m_0, u_0, E_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$ such that if $\sigma_1 \leq \bar{\sigma}_1$ and $\sigma_2 \leq \bar{\sigma}_2$, then the nonlinear boundary value problem (2.3)–(2.6) and (2.9)–(2.12) has a unique solution $(\varphi, \Phi, \mathscr{S}, \phi) \in [H^4(\Omega)]^3 \times H^5(\Omega)$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\varphi - \varphi_0\|_{H^4(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|\Phi - \Phi_0\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \leq C\left((\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} + \mathscr{S}_0)\sigma_1 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\sigma_2\right), \\ &\|\mathscr{S} - \mathscr{S}_0\|_{H^4(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0\|\phi\|_{H^5(\Omega)} \leq C\sigma_2, \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

where the constant $C > 0$ depends only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0).

The proof of the equivalence between Theorem 1.6 and Theorem 2.1 is the same as the proof of Theorem 2.7 in [3].

Considering (2.3)–(2.5) as second order equations for (φ, Φ, ϕ), respectively, if $(\varphi, \Phi, \phi, \mathscr{S})$ solve the boundary value problem (2.3)–(2.6) with boundary conditions (2.9)–(2.12), and they satisfy (2.14) for sufficiently small σ_1 and σ_2, then the estimate (1.17) implies that the equation (2.3) is strictly hyperbolic in Ω while the equations (2.4)–(2.5) are uniformly elliptic in Ω. The biggest challenge in proving Theorem 2.1 is to establish the well-posedness of a boundary value problem for second order nonlinear hyperbolic-elliptic coupled system, which is associated with (2.3)-(2.4). In order to capture the essential difficulty, we first consider the case of irrotational flow.

2.2. **Irrotational flows.** If the entropy is a constant, that is $\mathscr{S} = \mathscr{S}_0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ for a constant $\mathscr{S}_0 > 0$, then we have curl $\mathbf{u} = 0$ in Ω, and this yields $\phi = 0$ in Ω. Therefore, the system

(2.3)–(2.4) is reduced to a system of two second order nonlinear equations for (φ, Φ), which are the velocity potential function and the electric potential function, respectively. Hence the Euler-Poisson system is reduced from (1.4) to

$$\operatorname{div}(\mathcal{H}_0(\Phi, \nabla\varphi)\nabla\varphi) = 0, \tag{2.15}$$

$$\Delta\Phi = \mathcal{H}_0(\Phi, \nabla\varphi) - b(\mathrm{x}), \tag{2.16}$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}_0(z, \mathbf{q}) = \left(\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma \mathscr{S}_0}\left(z - \frac{|\mathbf{q}|^2}{2}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \qquad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{2.17}$$

We consider the system (2.15)-(2.16) with boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} &(\varphi, \varphi_{x_1}, \Phi_{x_1}) = (\varphi_{en}, u_{en}, E_{en}) \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_0, \\ &\varphi_{x_2} = \Phi_{x_2} = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Lambda, \\ &\Phi = \Phi_{ex} \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_L. \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

These boundary conditions correspond to prescribing the velocity field (u, v) and a constant entropy at the upstream for the Euler-Poisson system. Suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi_{en} = \varphi_0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_0, \quad \text{and } \Phi_{ex} = \Phi_0(L) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_L, \\ &\frac{d^k}{dx_2^k} u_{en}(\pm 1) = \frac{d^k}{dx_2^k} E_{en}(\pm 1) = 0 \qquad \text{for } k = 1,\ 3, \\ &\partial_{x_2} b(\mathrm{x}) = 0 \qquad \text{for } \mathrm{x}_1 \in \bar{\Lambda}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

where φ_0 and Φ_0 are defined in (2.13).

Denote

$$\tilde{\sigma}_1 := \|u_{en} - u_0\|_{C^5(\overline{\Omega})} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\sigma}_2 := \|b - b_0\|_{C^2(\overline{\Omega})} + \|E_{en} - E_0\|_{C^4([-1,1])}. \tag{2.20}$$

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that $E_0 > \kappa_0$ for some constant $\kappa_0 > 0$. Then, there exists a constant $\underline{\mathscr{L}}_0 > 1$ depending only on L, m_0, and κ_0 so that if (φ_0, Φ_0) is given by (2.13) corresponding to $(b_0, u_0, E_0) \in \mathfrak{P}(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$ with $\mathscr{S}_0 \geq \underline{\mathscr{L}}_0$, then there exist two positive constants $\tilde{\sigma}_1^*$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_2^*$ such that if $\tilde{\sigma}_1 \leq \tilde{\sigma}_1^*$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_2 \leq \tilde{\sigma}_2^*$, then the nonlinear boundary value problem (2.15)–(2.18) has a unique solution $(\varphi, \Phi) \in [H^4(\Omega) \cap C^2(\overline{\Omega})]^2$. Furthermore, it satisfies*

$$\|\varphi - \varphi_0\|_{H^4(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \|\Phi - \Phi_0\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \leq C(\tilde{\sigma}_1 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \tilde{\sigma}_2),$$

where the positive constant C depends only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0). Here, the constant $\tilde{\sigma}_1^*$ can be chosen depending only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0), while $\tilde{\sigma}_2^*$ is determined depending on $(L, m_0, u_0, E_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$.

Remark 2.3. *It is different from the case of general flow that the choice of $\underline{\mathscr{L}}_0$ in Theorem 2.2 is independent of E_0. Also, note that the constant $\tilde{\sigma}_1^*$ in Theorem 2.2 is chosen independently of $\mathscr{S}_0$.*

Fix $(b_0, u_0, E_0) \in \mathfrak{P}(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$, and set

$$\psi_{bd}(\mathrm{x}) := (u_{en}(x_2) - u_0)x_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Psi_{bd}(\mathrm{x}) = (E_{en}(x_2) - E_0)(x_1 - L) \tag{2.21}$$

for $\mathrm{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega$. Define

$$\psi := \varphi - \varphi_0 - \psi_{bd} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Psi = \Phi - \Phi_0 - \Psi_{bd}.$$

If (φ, Φ) satisfies all the boundary conditions in (2.18) for $(\varphi_{en}, \Phi_{ex})(x_2) = (\varphi_0(0), \Phi_0(L))$, and (u_{en}, E_{en}) satisfies the compatibility conditions (2.19), then (ψ, Ψ) satisfies the following homogeneous boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} &(\psi, \psi_{x_1}, \Psi_{x_1}) = (0, 0, 0) \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_0, \\ &\psi_{x_2} = \Psi_{x_2} = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Lambda, \\ &\Psi = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_L. \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

Let

$$c(z, \mathbf{q}) = \sqrt{(\gamma - 1)\left(z - \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{q}|^2\right)}. \tag{2.23}$$

In fact, $c(\Phi, \nabla\varphi)$ is exactly the local sound speed for the irrotational flow. If $c^2(\Phi, \nabla\varphi) - \varphi_{x_2}^2 \neq 0$ in Ω, then the equation (2.15) can be written as

$$A_{11}(\Phi, \nabla\varphi)\varphi_{x_1x_1} + 2A_{12}(\Phi, \nabla\varphi)\varphi_{x_1x_2} + \varphi_{x_2x_2} + B(\Phi, \nabla\Phi, \nabla\varphi) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \tag{2.24}$$

where A_{11}, A_{12}, and B are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &A_{11}(z, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{c^2(z, |\mathbf{q}|^2) - q_1^2}{c^2(z, |\mathbf{q}|^2) - q_2^2}, \quad A_{12}(z, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{-q_1q_2}{c^2(z, |\mathbf{q}|^2) - q_2^2}, \\ &B(z, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q}}{c^2(z, |\mathbf{q}|^2) - q_2^2} \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

for $z \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Note that φ_0 and Φ_0 satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \bar{A}_{11}\partial_{x_1x_1}\varphi_0 + \bar{B} = 0, \\ \Delta\Phi_0 = \mathcal{H}_0(\Phi_0, \nabla\varphi_0) - b_0, \end{cases} \tag{2.26}$$

where

$$\bar{A}_{11} = A_{11}(\Phi_0, \nabla\varphi_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{B} = B(\Phi_0, \nabla\Phi_0, \nabla\varphi_0).$$

Subtracting the first equation in (2.26) from (2.24) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &A_{11}\psi_{x_1x_1}+2A_{12}\psi_{x_1x_2}+\psi_{x_2x_2}+(B-\bar{B}+(A_{11}-\bar{A}_{11})\bar{u}')\\ =&-(A_{11}\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_{bd}+2A_{12}\partial_{x_1x_2}\psi_{bd}+\partial_{x_2x_2}\psi_{bd}) \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

with $A_{1j}=A_{1j}(\Phi,\nabla\varphi)$ $(j=1,\,2)$ and $B=B(\Phi,\nabla\Phi,\nabla\varphi)$. Set

$$Q(\mathrm{x},z,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})=B(z,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})+A_{11}(z,\mathbf{q})\bar{u}'(x_1). \tag{2.28}$$

Note that $Q(\mathrm{x},\Phi_0,\nabla\Phi_0,\nabla\varphi_0)=0$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{a}_{11}(x_1)=A_{11}(\Phi_0,\nabla\varphi_0),\\ &(\bar{a}_1,\bar{b}_1,\bar{b}_2)=(\partial_{q_1},\partial_{p_1},\partial_z)Q(\mathrm{x},z,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})|_{(z,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})=(\Phi_0,\nabla\Phi_0,\nabla\varphi_0)},\\ &a_{1j}(\mathrm{x},z,\mathbf{q})=A_{1j}(\Phi_0+z,\nabla\varphi_0+\nabla\psi_{bd}+\mathbf{q})\qquad \text{for } j=1,2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

Direct computations using (1.15) show that

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{a}_{11}(x_1)=1-\frac{\bar{u}^{\gamma+1}}{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}},\quad \bar{a}_1(x_1)=-\frac{\bar{E}(\gamma\bar{u}^{\gamma+1}+\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1})}{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}(\bar{u}^2-\frac{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}}{\bar{u}^{\gamma-1}})},\\ &\bar{b}_1(x_1)=\frac{\bar{u}^{\gamma}}{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}},\quad \bar{b}_2(x_1)=\frac{(\gamma-1)\bar{E}\bar{u}^{\gamma}}{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}(\bar{u}^2-\frac{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}}{\bar{u}^{\gamma-1}})}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

In terms of these notations, the equation (2.27) is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_1(\psi,\Psi):=&a_{11}(\mathrm{x},\Psi,\nabla\psi)\psi_{x_1x_1}+2a_{12}(\mathrm{x},\Psi,\nabla\psi)\psi_{x_1x_2}+\psi_{x_2x_2}\\ &+\bar{a}_1(x_1)\psi_{x_1}+\bar{b}_1(x_1)\Psi_{x_1}+\bar{b}_2(x_1)\Psi\\ =&\mathfrak{f}_1(\mathrm{x},\Psi,\nabla\Psi,\nabla\psi), \end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

where $\mathfrak{f}_1(\mathrm{x},z,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{f}_1(\mathrm{x},z,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})=&-(a_{11}(\mathrm{x},z,\mathbf{q})\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_{bd}+2a_{12}(\mathrm{x},z,\mathbf{q})\partial_{x_1x_2}\psi_{bd}+\partial_{x_2x_2}\psi_{bd})\\ &-\big(Q(\mathrm{x},\Phi_0+\Psi_{bd}+z,\nabla(\Phi_0+\Psi_{bd})+\mathbf{p},\nabla(\varphi_0+\psi_{bd})+\mathbf{q})\\ &-\bar{a}_1(x_1)q_1-\bar{b}_1(x_1)p_1-\bar{b}_2(x_1)z\big). \end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

Define

$$\hat{a}_{11}(\mathrm{x},z,\mathbf{q})=a_{11}(\mathrm{x},z,\mathbf{q})-\bar{a}_{11}(x_1), \tag{2.33}$$

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\delta_0,R}=\{(z,\mathbf{q})\in&\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^2|\ z\in(-R,R),\ |\mathbf{q}|<R,\\ &c^2(\Phi_0+\Psi_{bd}+z,|\nabla(\varphi_0+\psi_{bd})+\mathbf{q}|^2)-(\partial_{x_2}\psi_{bd}+q_2)^2>\delta_0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

Then it is easy to have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that $(\bar\rho,\bar u,\bar p,\bar E)$ satisfies all the conditions in Proposition 1.3. Then there exist $\delta_0>0$ and $R>0$ such that the following properties hold:*

(a) $(\hat a_{11}, a_{12})(\mathrm{x}, z, \mathbf{q})$ *are smooth in* $\overline{\Omega}\times U_{\delta_0,R}$.

(b) *For each nonnegative integer k, there exists a constant $C_R>0$ depending on $(L, m_0, E_0, u_0, \delta_0, R, k)$ such that*

$$|D^k_{(z,\mathbf{q})}\hat a_{11}(\mathrm{x},z,\mathbf{q})|\le C_R \qquad \text{and} \qquad |D^k_{(z,\mathbf{q})}a_{12}(\mathrm{x},z,\mathbf{q})|\le C_R, \tag{2.35}$$

hold for all $(\mathrm{x},z,\mathbf{q})\in\overline{\Omega}\times U_{\delta_0,R}$.

Next, suppose that $(\varphi,\Phi)\in[C^2(\Omega)]^2$ satisfy the equation (2.16) and $\mathcal{H}_0(\Phi,\nabla\varphi)>0$ in Ω. Subtracting the second equation in (2.26) from (2.16) gives

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\psi,\Psi):=\Delta\Psi-\bar h_1(x_1)\Psi-\bar h_2(x_1)\psi_{x_1}=\mathfrak{f}_2(\mathrm{x},\Psi,\nabla\psi)\quad\text{in}\quad\Omega, \tag{2.36}$$

where

$$(\bar h_1,\bar h_2)(x_1)=(\partial_z\mathcal{H}_0,\partial_{q_1}\mathcal{H}_0)(z,\mathbf{q})|_{(z,\mathbf{q})=(\Phi_0,\nabla\varphi_0)}=\frac{\bar u^{\gamma-2}}{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-2}\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}}\,(1,-\bar u)\,, \tag{2.37}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{f}_2(\mathrm{x},z,\mathbf{q})=&\Big(\mathcal{H}_0(\Phi_0+\Psi_{bd}+z,\nabla(\varphi_0+\psi_{bd})+\mathbf{q})-\mathcal{H}_0(\Phi_0,\nabla\varphi_0)-\bar h_1 z-\bar h_2 q_1\Big)\\&-\Delta\Psi_{bd}-(b-b_0).\end{aligned} \tag{2.38}$$

If $c^2(\Phi,\nabla\varphi)-\varphi_{x_2}^2\neq 0$ in Ω, then the nonlinear boundary value problem (2.15)–(2.18) is equivalent to the system of the equations (2.31) and (2.36) with boundary conditions (2.22).

To prove Theorem 2.2, it suffices to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 2.5. *Under the assumptions same as in Theorem 2.2 , there exists a constant $\underline{\mathscr{L}}_0>1$ depending only on (L,m_0,κ_0) so that whenever $\mathscr{S}_0\ge\underline{\mathscr{L}}_0$, one can choose two positive constants $\tilde\sigma_1^*$ and $\tilde\sigma_2^*$ such that if $\tilde\sigma_1$ and $\tilde\sigma_2$ defined in (2.20) satisfy $\tilde\sigma_1\le\tilde\sigma_1^*$ and $\tilde\sigma_2\le\tilde\sigma_2^*$, then the nonlinear boundary value problem (2.31), (2.36), and (2.22) has a unique solution $(\psi,\Psi)\in[H^4(\Omega)\cap C^2(\overline{\Omega})]^2$ satisfying*

$$\|\psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)}+\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|\Psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)}\le C(\tilde\sigma_1+\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\tilde\sigma_2)$$

for a constant $C>0$ depending only on (L,m_0,u_0,E_0). The constant $\tilde\sigma_1^*$ can be chosen depending only on (L,m_0,u_0,E_0) while $\tilde\sigma_2^*$ is determined depending on $(L,m_0,u_0,E_0,\mathscr{S}_0)$.

3. Well-posedness of a linear hyperbolic-elliptic coupled system

3.1. **Linearized boundary value problem.** Given a constant $\delta > 0$, denote

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{I}_\delta := \{&(\psi,\Psi)\in[H^4(\Omega)]^2 : \|(\psi,\Psi)\|_{H^4(\Omega)}\le\delta,\\ &\partial_{x_2}^k\psi=\partial_{x_2}^k\Psi=0 \text{ on } \Lambda \text{ in the sense of trace for } k=1,3\}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.1}$$

Suppose that u_{en}, $E_{en}\in C^4([-1,1])$ satisfy the conditions in Theorem 2.2, and let (ψ_{bd},Ψ_{bd}) be defined in (2.21). For a fixed $(\tilde\psi,\tilde\Psi)\in\mathfrak{I}_\delta$, set

$$\tilde a_{11}(\mathrm{x}) := a_{11}(\mathrm{x},\tilde\Psi,\nabla\tilde\psi) \quad\text{and}\quad \tilde a_{12}(\mathrm{x}) := a_{12}(\mathrm{x},\tilde\Psi,\nabla\tilde\psi),$$

where $(a_{11},a_{12})(\mathrm{x},z,\mathbf{q})$ are defined in (2.29). Furthermore, it follows from (2.19), (2.21), (2.30), (2.33), and (3.1) that one has

$$\partial_{x_2}\tilde a_{11}=\tilde a_{12}=0 \quad\text{on}\quad \Lambda.\tag{3.2}$$

Lemma 3.1. *There exist constants $\bar\delta\in(0,1]$ and C depending only on (L,m_0,u_0,E_0) so that if $\max\{\delta,\tilde\sigma_1,\tilde\sigma_2\}\le\bar\delta$ in the definition* (3.1)*, then the coefficients $\tilde a_{11}(\mathrm{x})$ and $\tilde a_{12}(\mathrm{x})$ satisfy*

$$\|(\tilde a_{11},\tilde a_{12})-(\bar a_{11},0)\|_{H^3(\Omega)}\le C(\delta+\tilde\sigma_1+\tilde\sigma_2),\tag{3.3}$$

$$\tilde a_{11}\le-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{u_0^{\gamma+1}}{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}}-1\right)<0 \quad \textit{in} \quad \overline{\Omega},\tag{3.4}$$

where $\bar a_{11}$ is defined in (2.29)*.*

Proof. For each $(\tilde\psi,\tilde\Psi)\in\mathfrak{I}_\delta$, Sobolev embedding theorem implies that $(\tilde\psi,\tilde\Psi)\in C^2(\bar\Omega)$. When $(\psi_{bd},\Psi_{bd})=(0,0)$ and $(z,\mathbf{q})=(0,\mathbf{0})$ with $\delta_0=\gamma(\frac{m_0}{U_0})^{\gamma-1}$ with U_0 appeared in (1.24), one can choose a constant $\bar\delta\in(0,1]$ depending only on (L,m_0,u_0,E_0) so that whenever $\max\{\delta,\tilde\sigma_1,\tilde\sigma_2\}\le\bar\delta$, it holds that

$$c^2(\Phi_0+\Psi_{bd}+\tilde\Psi,|\nabla\varphi_0+\nabla\psi_{bd}+\nabla\tilde\psi|)-(\partial_{x_2}(\psi_{bd}+\tilde\psi))^2\ge\frac{\gamma}{10}\left(\frac{m_0}{U_0}\right)^{\gamma-1}.$$

Hence the first estimate in (3.3) follows directly from (2.35).

Proposition 1.2 shows that $\bar u\ge u_0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$. This implies that $\bar a_{11}$ given in (2.30) satisfies

$$\bar a_{11}\le-\left(\frac{u_0^{\gamma+1}}{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}}-1\right)<0 \quad\text{in}\quad \overline{\Omega}.$$

Therefore, we adjust $\bar\delta>0$ depending only on (L,m_0,u_0,E_0) so that the first estimate in (3.3) yields (3.4). □

For a fixed $(\tilde\psi,\tilde\Psi)\in\mathfrak{I}_\delta$, define a linear operator $\mathcal{L}_1^{(\tilde\psi,\tilde\Psi)}:[H^4(\Omega)]^2\to H^2(\Omega)$ by

$$\mathcal{L}_1^{(\tilde\psi,\tilde\Psi)}(\psi,\Psi)=\tilde a_{11}(\mathrm{x})\psi_{x_1x_1}+2\tilde a_{12}\psi_{x_1x_2}+\psi_{x_2x_2}+\bar a_1(x_1)\psi_{x_1}+\bar b_1(x_1)\Psi_{x_1}+\bar b_2(x_1)\Psi.$$

Given $f_1 \in H^3(\Omega)$ and $f_2 \in H^2(\Omega)$, consider a linear boundary value problem for the system

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_1^{(\tilde{\psi},\tilde{\Psi})}(\psi,\Psi) = f_1 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ \mathcal{L}_2(\psi,\Psi) = f_2 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

with boundary conditions (2.22). Let $\bar{\delta}$ be from Lemma 3.1 and suppose that $\max\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \delta\} \le \bar{\delta}$. The problem for (3.5) and (2.22) is a boundary value problem for a linear hyperbolic-elliptic coupled system whose well-posedness is not generally known.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\bar{\delta}$ be from Lemma 3.1. Suppose that $(b_0, u_0, E_0) \in \mathfrak{P}(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$, and $E_0 \ge \kappa_0$ for some constant $\kappa_0 > 0$. Let (φ_0, Φ_0) be defined by (2.13). If $(f_1, f_2) \in H^3(\Omega) \times H^2(\Omega)$ satisfy compatibility conditions*

$$\partial_{x_2} f_1 = \partial_{x_2} f_2 = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Lambda \text{ in the sense of trace}, \tag{3.6}$$

then one can choose $\underline{\mathscr{L}}_0^* > 1$ depending only on (L, m_0, κ_0), and reduce $\bar{\delta} > 0$ depending only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0) so that whenever $\mathscr{S}_0 \ge \underline{\mathscr{L}}_0^*$ and $\max\{\delta, \sigma_1, \sigma_2\} \le \bar{\delta}$ hold, the linear boundary value problem (3.5) and (2.22) has a solution $(\psi, \Psi) \in [H^4(\Omega) \cap C^2(\overline{\Omega})]^2$ satisfying

$$\|\psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \|\Psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \le \mathcal{C}(\|f_1\|_{H^3(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \|f_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)}) \tag{3.7}$$

for a constant $\mathcal{C} > 0$ depending only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0). Furthermore, such a solution is unique.

The rest of the section is devoted to prove this proposition.

3.2. **Smooth approximation of coefficients.**

Lemma 3.3. *Fix $(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\Psi}) \in \mathfrak{I}_\delta$. For each small $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $(\tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon, \tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon) \in [C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})]^2$ which satisfies*

$$\|(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\Psi}) - (\tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon, \tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon)\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \le \varepsilon \qquad \text{and} \qquad \partial_{x_2} \tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon = \partial_{x_2} \tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon = 0 \text{ on } \Lambda. \tag{3.8}$$

Lemma 3.3 can be proved by a standard mollifier technique. We omit the details here.

Fix $(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\Psi}) \in \mathfrak{I}_\delta$. Let $(\tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon, \tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon) \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ be the approximated functions in Lemma 3.3 satisfying (3.8). Denote

$$a_{1j}^\varepsilon(\mathrm{x}) := a_{1j}(\mathrm{x}, \tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon, \nabla\tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon) \qquad \text{for } j = 1, 2,$$

where each a_{1j} is defined in (2.29) and Ψ_{bd}, $\nabla\psi_{bd}$, $\tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon$, and $\nabla\tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon$ are evaluated at $\mathrm{x} \in \overline{\Omega}$. By Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3, there exists a constant $\bar{\delta} > 0$ depending on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0) so that if

$\max\{\varepsilon, \delta, \tilde{\sigma}_1, \tilde{\sigma}_2\} \le \bar{\delta}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(a_{11}^\varepsilon, a_{12}^\varepsilon) - (\bar{a}_{11}, 0)\|_{H^3(\Omega)} \le C(\varepsilon + \delta + \tilde{\sigma}_1 + \tilde{\sigma}_2), \\ &\partial_{x_2} a_{11}^\varepsilon = a_{12}^\varepsilon = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Lambda, \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

$$a_{11}^\varepsilon \le -\frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{u_0^{\gamma+1}}{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}} - 1\right) < 0 \qquad \text{in } \overline{\Omega}. \tag{3.10}$$

The rest of this section is to study the linear boundary value problem for the system

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_1^{(\tilde{\Psi}^\varepsilon, \tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon)}(\psi, \Psi) = f_1 \\ \mathcal{L}_2(\psi, \Psi) = f_2 \end{cases} \qquad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \tag{3.11}$$

with boundary conditions (2.22) for given functions $f_1,\ f_2 \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfying the compatibility conditions (3.6).

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^*$ and $\bar{\delta}$ be from Proposition 3.2. Suppose that $\mathscr{S}_0$, (b_0, u_0, E_0), $(\delta, \tilde{\sigma}_1, \tilde{\sigma}_2)$ satisfy all the conditions stated in Proposition 3.2. If, in addition, $f_1, f_2 \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfy the compatibility condition* (3.6)*, then the linear boundary value problem* (3.11) *and* (2.22) *has a unique solution $(\psi, \Psi) \in [H^4(\Omega) \cap C^2(\overline{\Omega})]^2$ satisfying*

$$\|\psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \|\Psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \le \mathcal{C}_*(\|f_1\|_{H^3(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \|f_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)}),$$

where the constant $\mathcal{C}_* > 0$ depends only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0).

Once Proposition 3.4 is proved, then Proposition 3.2 is proved by a limiting procedure.

In the rest of the paper, all estimate constants such as $\bar{\delta}$, C, μ_0, μ_1 depend only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0), but they may change from line to line.

3.3. **Galerkin's approximation and a priori H^1 estimate.** In the rest of section, we remove ε in a_{11}^ε and a_{12}^ε for ease of notations. Set $\Gamma := (-1, 1)$ and let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the standard inner product defined on $L^2(\Gamma)$ as follows,

$$\langle \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \rangle = \int_{-1}^{1} \zeta_1(s)\zeta_2(s)\, ds.$$

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, set $\eta_k(x_2) := \cos((k-1)\pi x_2)$. Then $\{\eta_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ form an orthogonal basis in $H^1(\Gamma)$ satisfying $\eta'(\pm 1) = 0$. For each $n = 1, 2, \cdots$, let (ψ_n, Ψ_n) be of the form

$$\psi_n(x_1, x_2) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \vartheta_j(x_1)\eta_j(x_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_n(x_1, x_2) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Theta_j(x_1)\eta_j(x_2). \tag{3.12}$$

Suppose that $\{\vartheta_j\}_{j=1}^n$ and $\{\Theta_j\}_{j=1}^n$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\langle a_{11}\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n + (\bar{a}_1 - 2\partial_{x_2}a_{12})\partial_{x_1}\psi_n + (\bar{b}_1\partial_{x_1}\Psi_n + \bar{b}_2\Psi_n), \eta_k\rangle \\ - \langle \partial_{x_2}\psi_n + 2a_{12}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n, \partial_{x_2}\eta_k\rangle = f_1^{(k)},\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

$$\langle \partial_{x_1x_1}\Psi_n - \bar{h}_1\Psi - \bar{h}_2\psi_{x_1}, \eta_k\rangle - \langle \partial_{x_2}\Psi_n, \partial_{x_2}\eta_k\rangle = f_2^{(k)} \tag{3.14}$$

for all $x_1 \in [0, L]$ and all $k = 1, \cdots, n$, where

$$f_1^{(k)} = \langle f_1, \eta_k\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad f_2^{(k)} = \langle f_2, \eta_k\rangle.$$

If, in addition, $\{(\vartheta_j, \Theta_j)\}_{j=1}^n$ satisfy the following boundary conditions,

$$\vartheta_j(0) = \vartheta_j'(0) = \Theta_j'(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_j(L) = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad j = 1, \cdots, n, \tag{3.15}$$

then we have the following a priori estimate.

Proposition 3.5. *Under the same assumptions as in Proposition 3.4, if (ψ_n, Ψ_n) satisfy (3.13)–(3.15), then there exist constants $\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^* > 1$, $\bar{\delta} > 0$, and $C > 0$ so that if $\mathscr{S}_0 \geq \underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^*$ and $\max\{\delta, \varepsilon, \sigma_1, \sigma_2\} \leq \bar{\delta}$ hold, then (ψ_n, Ψ_n) satisfy*

$$\|\psi_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|\Psi_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C(\|f_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|f_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}). \tag{3.16}$$

Proof. For a large constant $N > 1$ to be determined, set

$$\mathcal{K}(x_1) := (L + 2 - x_1)^N.$$

Multiplying (3.13) by $\mathcal{K}\vartheta_k'(x_1)$, taking the summation for $k = 1, \cdots, n$, and integrating the associated expression over $(0, L)$ with respect to x_1 yield

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_1^{(1)} :=& \int_\Omega \big(a_{11}\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n + (\bar{a}_1 - 2\partial_{x_2}a_{12})\partial_{x_1}\psi_n\big)\mathcal{K}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n - (\partial_{x_2}\psi_n + 2a_{12}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)\mathcal{K}\partial_{x_1x_2}\psi_n \, d\mathrm{x} \\ &+ \int_\Omega (\bar{b}_1\partial_{x_1}\Psi_n + \bar{b}_2\Psi_n)\mathcal{K}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n \, d\mathrm{x} = \int_\Omega f_1\mathcal{K}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n \, d\mathrm{x}.\end{aligned}$$

Integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_1^{(1)} =& \frac{\mathcal{K}(L)}{2}\int_{\Gamma_L} a_{11}(\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)^2 - (\partial_{x_2}\psi_n)^2 \, dx_2 \\ &+ \int_\Omega \left(\bar{a}_1 - \partial_{x_2}a_{12} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}}\frac{(\mathcal{K}a_{11})_{x_1}}{2}\right)\mathcal{K}(\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)^2 + \frac{\mathcal{K}'}{2}(\partial_{x_2}\psi_n)^2 \, d\mathrm{x} \\ &+ \int_\Omega (\bar{b}_1\partial_{x_1}\Psi_n + \bar{b}_2\Psi_n)\mathcal{K}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n \, d\mathrm{x} = \int_\Omega f_1\mathcal{K}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n \, d\mathrm{x},\end{aligned}$$

where we use the boundary condition (3.15) and the property $a_{12} = 0$ on Λ.

Similarly, multiplying (3.14) by $\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\Theta_k$, summing for $k=1,\cdots,n$, and integrating the corresponding expression over $(0,L)$ with respect to x_1 give

$$\mathcal{I}_2^{(1)} := \int_\Omega \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}|\nabla\Psi_n|^2 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\bar{h}_1\Psi_n^2 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\bar{h}_2\partial_{x_1}\psi_n\Psi_n \,d\mathrm{x} = -\int_\Omega \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} f_2\Psi_n \,d\mathrm{x}.$$

Set $\mathcal{I}^{(1)} := -\mathcal{I}_1^{(1)} + \mathcal{I}_2^{(1)}$. We represent $\mathcal{I}^{(1)}$ as $\mathcal{I}^{(1)} = \mathcal{G}_1 + \mathcal{M}_1$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_1 =& -\frac{\mathcal{K}(L)}{2}\int_{\Gamma_L} a_{11}(\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)^2 - (\partial_{x_2}\psi_n)^2\,dx_2 + \int_\Omega \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}|\nabla\Psi_n|^2 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\bar{h}_1\Psi_n^2\,d\mathrm{x}\\ &-\int_\Omega\left(\bar{a}_1 - \partial_{x_2}a_{12} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}}\frac{(\mathcal{K}a_{11})_{x_1}}{2}\right)\mathcal{K}(\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)^2 + \frac{\mathcal{K}'}{2}(\partial_{x_2}\psi_n)^2\,d\mathrm{x},\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{M}_1 = \int_\Omega \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\bar{h}_2\Psi_n\partial_{x_1}\psi_n - (\bar{b}_1\partial_{x_1}\Psi_n + \bar{b}_2\Psi_n)\mathcal{K}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n\,d\mathrm{x}.$$

It follows from (2.30) and (1.15) that one has

$$\bar{a}_1 - \frac{\bar{a}_{11}'}{2} = -\frac{\bar{E}}{\bar{c}^2(\bar{u}^2-\bar{c}^2)}\left(\bar{c}^2 + \frac{\gamma-1}{2}\bar{u}^2\right) \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{c}^2 = \gamma\left(\frac{m_0}{\bar{u}}\right)^{\gamma-1}.$$

By Propositions 1.2 and 1.3, if $\mathscr{S}_0 \geq \underline{\mathscr{S}}_0$ for $\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0$ from Proposition 1.3, then there exists a constant $\mu_0 > 0$ such that

$$-\frac{1}{2\mu_0} \leq \bar{a}_1 - \frac{\bar{a}_{11}'}{2} \leq -2\mu_0 \qquad \text{in } \overline{\Omega}. \tag{3.17}$$

With the aid of (3.17), (3.10), and (3.9), one can find positive constants μ_1 and C so that

$$\bar{a}_1 - \partial_{x_2}a_{12} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}}\frac{(\mathcal{K}a_{11})_{x_1}}{2} \leq (-2\mu_1 + C(\delta+\varepsilon+\tilde{\sigma}_1+\tilde{\sigma}_2))\left(1+\frac{N}{2(L+2)}\right) \quad \text{in} \quad \overline{\Omega}.$$

We further reduce $\bar{\delta}$ so that if $\max\{\delta,\varepsilon,\tilde{\sigma}_1,\tilde{\sigma}_2\} \leq \bar{\delta}$, then one has

$$\bar{a}_1 - \partial_{x_2}a_{12} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{K}}\frac{(\mathcal{K}a_{11})_{x_1}}{2} \leq -\mu_1\left(1+\frac{N}{2(L+2)}\right) \quad \text{in} \quad \overline{\Omega}. \tag{3.18}$$

It follows from Proposition 1.2 that one has

$$\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\bar{h}_1 = \frac{m_0^{2-\gamma}}{\gamma}\bar{u}^{\gamma-2} \geq \frac{m_0^{2-\gamma}\hat{U}^{\gamma-2}}{\gamma} \quad \text{in} \quad \overline{\Omega}, \tag{3.19}$$

where $\hat{U} = u_0$ if $\gamma > 2$ and $\hat{U} = U_0$ if $\gamma \leq 2$ for the constant $U_0 > 0$ from (1.24). Combining (3.10), (3.18), and (3.19) together yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}_1 \geq\ & 2^{N-1}\int_{\Gamma_L}\frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{u_0^{\gamma+1}}{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}} - 1\right)(\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)^2 + (\partial_{x_2}\psi_n)^2\,dx_2 + \int_\Omega \frac{N\mathcal{K}}{2(L+2)}(\partial_{x_2}\psi_n)^2\,d\mathrm{x}\\ &+\int_\Omega \mu_1\left(1+\frac{N}{2(L+2)}\right)\mathcal{K}(\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)^2\,d\mathrm{x} + \int_\Omega \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}|\nabla\Psi_n|^2 + \frac{m_0^{2-\gamma}\hat{U}^{\gamma-2}}{\gamma}\Psi_n^2\,d\mathrm{x}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

By Proposition 1.2, there exists a constant $\mu_2 > 0$ such that

$$|\bar{b}_1| + |\bar{b}_2| \le \mu_2 \quad \text{in} \quad \overline{\Omega}. \tag{3.21}$$

Therefore, one has

$$\left| \int_\Omega (\bar{b}_1 \partial_{x_1} \Psi_n + \bar{b}_2 \Psi_n) \mathcal{K} \partial_{x_1} \psi_n \, d\mathrm{x} \right| \le \int_\Omega \mathcal{K}((\partial_{x_1}\Psi_n)^2 + \Psi_n^2) \, d\mathrm{x} + \mu_2^2 \int_\Omega \mathcal{K}(\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)^2 \, d\mathrm{x}, \tag{3.22}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_\Omega \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \bar{h}_2 \Psi_n \partial_{x_1} \psi_n \, d\mathrm{x} \right| \le & \frac{1}{8} \int_\Omega \frac{m_0^{2-\gamma} \hat{U}^{\gamma-2}}{\gamma} \Psi_n^2 \, d\mathrm{x} \\ & + \int_\Omega \frac{2\gamma}{m_0^{2-\gamma} \hat{U}^{\gamma-2}} \left(\frac{m_0^{2-\gamma} \bar{u}^{\gamma-1}}{\gamma} \right)^2 (\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)^2 \, d\mathrm{x}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Combining (3.20) and (3.22) together gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}^{(1)} \ge & 2^{N-1} \int_{\Gamma_L} \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{u_0^{\gamma+1}}{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}} - 1 \right) (\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)^2 + (\partial_{x_2}\psi_n)^2 \, dy \\ & + \int_\Omega \left(\mu_1 \left(1 + \frac{N}{2(L+2)} \right) - \mu_2^2 - \frac{C}{\mathcal{K}} \right) \mathcal{K} (\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)^2 + \frac{N}{2(L+2)} \mathcal{K} (\partial_{x_2}\psi_n)^2 \, d\mathrm{x} \\ & + \int_\Omega (\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} - \mathcal{K}) |\nabla \Psi_n|^2 + \int_\Omega \left(\frac{7 m_0^{2-\gamma} \hat{U}^{\gamma-2}}{8\gamma} - \mathcal{K} \right) \Psi_n^2 \, d\mathrm{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\Psi_n = 0$ on Γ_L, using Poincaré inequality yields

$$\int_\Omega \mathcal{K} \Psi_n^2 \, d\mathrm{x} \le 16 (L+2)^{N+2} \int_\Omega |\nabla \Psi_n|^2 \, d\mathrm{x}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}^{(1)} \ge & 2^{N-1} \int_{\Gamma_L} \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{u_0^{\gamma+1}}{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}} - 1 \right) (\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)^2 + (\partial_{x_2}\psi_n)^2 \, dx_2 \\ & + \int_\Omega \left(\mu_1 \left(1 + \frac{N}{2(L+2)} \right) - \mu_2^2 - \frac{C}{\mathcal{K}} \right) \mathcal{K} (\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)^2 + \frac{N}{2(L+2)} \mathcal{K} (\partial_{x_2}\psi_n)^2 \, d\mathrm{x} \\ & + \int_\Omega (\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} - 17(L+2)^{N+2}) |\nabla \Psi_n|^2 + \frac{7 m_0^{2-\gamma} \hat{U}^{\gamma-2}}{8\gamma} \int_\Omega \Psi_n^2 \, d\mathrm{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $N > 1$ large to obtain

$$\mu_1 \left(1 + \frac{N}{2(L+2)} \right) - \mu_2^2 - \frac{C}{\mathcal{K}} \ge \mu_1 \quad \text{in} \quad \overline{\Omega}. \tag{3.24}$$

Furthermore, if one chooses $\underline{\mathscr{L}}_0^* \ge \underline{\mathscr{L}}_0$($\underline{\mathscr{L}}_0$ from Proposition 1.3) depending on (L, m_0, κ_0, N) so that the inequality

$$\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} - 17(L+2)^N \ge \frac{1}{2} \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} \quad \text{in} \quad \overline{\Omega}$$

holds provided that $\mathscr{S}_0 \geq \underline{\mathscr{L}}_0^*$, then we have

$$\mathcal{I}^{(1)} \geq 2^{N-1}\int_{\Gamma_L}\frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{u_0^{\gamma+1}}{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}}-1\right)\partial_{x_1}\psi_n^2+\partial_{x_2}\psi_n^2\,dx_2+\int_\Omega \mu_1\mathcal{K}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n^2+\frac{N}{2(L+2)}\mathcal{K}(\partial_{x_2}\psi_n)^2\,d\mathrm{x}$$
$$+\int_\Omega\frac{1}{2}\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}|\nabla\Psi_n|^2+\frac{7m_0^{2-\gamma}\hat{U}^{\gamma-2}}{8\gamma}\int_\Omega\Psi_n^2\,d\mathrm{x}.$$

Combining this with Poincaré inequality and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields (3.16). This finishes the proof of the proposition. □

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\underline{\mathscr{L}}_0^*$ and $\bar\delta$ be chosen as in Proposition 3.5. Then one can further reduce $\bar\delta$ depending only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0) so that if $max\{\delta,\varepsilon,\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}\leq\bar\delta$, then for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, there exists a unique solution $(\psi_n,\Psi_n)\in[C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})]^2$ of the problem (3.13)–(3.15).*

Proof. Since the estimate (3.16) in Proposition 3.5 implies the uniqueness, it suffices to prove the existence of $\{(\vartheta_j,\Theta_j)\}_{j=1}^n$ solving the following system of ordinary differential equations

$$\sum_{j=1}^n\left[\langle a_{11}\eta_j,\eta_k\rangle\vartheta_j''+(\langle(\bar a_1-2\partial_{x_2}a_{12})\eta_j,\eta_k\rangle-2\langle a_{12}\eta_j,\eta_k'\rangle)\vartheta_j'\right]$$
$$+\lambda_k\vartheta_k+\bar b_1\Theta_k'+\bar b_2\Theta_k=f_1^{(k)},\tag{3.25}$$

$$\Theta_k''-(\lambda_k+\bar h_1)\Theta_k+\bar h_2\vartheta_k'=f_2^{(k)},\tag{3.26}$$

with the boundary condition (3.15).

Set

$$\Xi_1:=(\vartheta_1,\cdots,\vartheta_n)^T,\ \ \Xi_2:=(\vartheta_1',\cdots,\vartheta_n')^T,\ \ \Xi_3:=(\Theta_1',\cdots,\Theta_n')^T,\ \ \Xi_4:=(\Theta_1,\cdots,\Theta_n)^T.$$

Obviously,

$$\Xi_1'=\Xi_2\quad\text{and}\quad\Xi_4'=\Xi_3.\tag{3.27}$$

Define three $n\times n$ matrices $\mathbf{M}^{(i)}=(M_{jk}^{(i)})_{j,k=1}^n$, $(i=0,\,1,\,2)$, as follows:

$$M_{jk}^{(0)}=\langle a_{11}\eta_j,\eta_k\rangle,\quad M_{jk}^{(1)}=\lambda_k\delta_{jk},\quad M_{jk}^{(2)}=2\langle a_{12}\eta_j,\eta_k'\rangle-\langle(\bar a_1-2\partial_{x_2}a_{12})\eta_j,\eta_k\rangle,$$

where δ_{jk} is the Kronecker symbol. Note that $\mathbf{M}^{(i)}$ $(i=0,\,1,\,2)$ are smooth functions of $x_1\in(0,L)$. It follows from (2.35) that one has

$$\|\mathbf{M}^{(0)}-\bar a_{11}\mathbf{I}_n\|_{C^0([0,L])}\leq C(\delta+\varepsilon+\tilde\sigma_1+\tilde\sigma_2).\tag{3.28}$$

Therefore, one can adjust $\bar\delta>0$ so that if

$$0<\max\{\delta,\varepsilon,\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}\leq\bar\delta,\tag{3.29}$$

then $\mathbf{M}^{(0)}$ is invertible. Combining (3.25) and (3.29) together yields

$$\Xi_3' = (\bar{h}_1\mathbf{I}_n + \mathbf{M}^{(1)})\Xi_4 + \bar{h}_2\Xi_2 + \mathbf{F}_n^{(2)}, \tag{3.30}$$

$$\Xi_2' = (\mathbf{M}^{(0)})^{-1}\left(\mathbf{M}^{(1)}\Xi_1 + \mathbf{M}^{(2)}\Xi_2 - \bar{b}_1\Xi_3 - \bar{b}_2\Xi_4 + \mathbf{F}_n^{(1)}\right), \tag{3.31}$$

where

$$\mathbf{F}_n^{(1)} = (f_1^{(1)}, \cdots, f_1^{(n)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{F}_n^{(2)} = (f_2^{(1)}, \cdots, f_2^{(n)}).$$

Under the condition (3.29), the ODE system of (3.27), (3.30), and (3.31) is equivalent to a $4n$-dimensional first order ODE system for

$$\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \cdots, X_{4n}) := (\vartheta_1, \cdots, \vartheta_n, \vartheta_1', \cdots, \vartheta_n', \Theta_1', \cdots, \Theta_n', \Theta_1, \cdots, \Theta_n)^T$$

in the form of

$$\mathbf{X}' = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{F} \tag{3.32}$$

on the interval $(0, L)$, where $\mathbf{A} : [0, L] \to \mathbb{R}^{4n\times 4n}$ and $\mathbf{F} : [0, L] \to \mathbb{R}^{4n}$ are smooth functions. Furthermore, the boundary conditions (3.15) can be written as

$$X_l(0) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad l = 1, \cdots, 3n \quad \text{and} \quad X_l(L) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad 3n < l \le 4n. \tag{3.33}$$

Let Π_i $(i = 1, 2)$ be the projections defined as follows

$$\Pi_1\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \cdots, X_{3n}, 0, \cdots, 0)^T \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_2 := \mathbf{I} - \Pi_1$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ is an identity map from $\mathbb{R}^{4n}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{4n}$. A C^1 function $\mathbf{X} : [0, L] \to \mathbb{R}^{4n}$ solves (3.32) if and only if it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1\mathbf{X}(x) - \int_0^x \Pi_1\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}(t)\, dt &= \int_0^x \Pi_1\mathbf{F}(t)\, dt, \\ \Pi_2\mathbf{X}(x) - \int_L^x \Pi_2\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}(t)\, dt &= \int_L^x \Pi_2\mathbf{F}(t)\, dt. \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

Set $\mathfrak{B} := \{\mathbf{X} : [0, L] \to \mathbb{R}^{4n} : \|\mathbf{X}\|_{C^1([0,L])} < \infty\}$. Define a linear operator $\mathfrak{K} : \mathfrak{B} \to \mathfrak{B}$ by

$$\mathfrak{K}\mathbf{X} = \Pi_1 \int_0^x \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}(t)\, dt + \Pi_2 \int_L^x \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}(t)\, dt.$$

$\mathbf{X} \in \mathfrak{B}$ satisfies (3.32)-(3.33) if and only if

$$(\mathbf{I} - \mathfrak{K})\mathbf{X} = \Pi_1 \int_0^x \mathbf{F}(t)\, dt + \Pi_2 \int_L^x \mathbf{F}(t)\, dt.$$

Let $\mathbf{X}^* = (X_1^*, \cdots, X_{4n}^*) \in \mathrm{Ker}(\mathbf{I} - \mathfrak{K})$, then

$$\psi_n^* = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i^*\eta_i \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_n^* = \sum_{i=3n+1}^{4n} X_i^*\eta_i$$

satisfy (3.13) and (3.14) with $(f_1, f_2) = (0, 0)$. By Proposition 3.5, we have

$$\psi_n^* = \Psi_n^* = 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega.$$

This implies that $X_i^* = 0$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and $i = 3n+1, \cdots, 4n$. Using the equations (3.27) yields $\mathbf{X}^* = 0$. Hence $\mathrm{Ker}(\mathbf{I} - \mathfrak{K}) = \{0\}$.

Since $\mathbf{A} : [0, L] \to \mathbb{R}^{4n\times 4n}$ is smooth, there exists a constant $k_0 > 0$ so that

$$\|\mathfrak{K}\mathbf{X}\|_{C^2([0,L])} \le k_0 \|\mathbf{X}\|_{C^1([0,L])}$$

holds for all $\mathbf{X} \in \mathfrak{B}$. Hence by the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, we obtain that the linear mapping $\mathfrak{K} : \mathfrak{B} \to \mathfrak{B}$ is compact. It follows from Fredholm alternative theorem that for any given $\mathbf{F} \in C^\infty([0, L]; \mathbb{R}^{4n})$, there exists a unique $\mathbf{X} \in \mathfrak{B}$ satisfying (3.34). The smoothness of solutions of ODE system directly follows from (3.32). This finishes the proof of the lemma. □

3.4. **Higher order derivative estimates.** For any given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\psi_n, \Psi_n) \in [C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})]^2$ be in the form of (3.12), and satisfy (3.13)–(3.15).

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\bar\delta > 0$ be chosen as in Lemma 3.6. One can further reduce $\bar\delta > 0$, and choose $C > 0$ depending only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0) so that if $\max\{\delta, \varepsilon, \tilde\sigma_1, \tilde\sigma_2\} \le \bar\delta$, then (ψ_n, Ψ_n) satisfy*

$$\|\Psi_n\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \le C(\mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \|\psi_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|f_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)}), \tag{3.35}$$

$$\|\psi_n\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \le C(\|\psi_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\Psi_n\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|f_1\|_{H^1(\Omega)}). \tag{3.36}$$

Proof. Since $\bar h_1$ and $\bar h_2$ depend only on $x_1 \in [0, L]$, the equation (3.14) is equivalent to

$$\Delta\Psi_n - \bar h_1 \Psi_n = \bar h_2 \partial_{x_1}\psi_n + \sum_{j=1}^n f_2^{(j)} \eta_j =: F_{2,n} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega. \tag{3.37}$$

Hence Ψ_n can be considered as a smooth solution to the elliptic equation (3.37) with boundary conditions

$$\partial_{x_1}\Psi_n = 0 \ \text{ on } \ \Gamma_0, \quad \Psi_n = 0 \ \text{ on } \ \Gamma_L, \quad \partial_{x_2}\Psi_n = 0 \ \text{ on } \ \Lambda.$$

By (3.19) and (3.21), we can adjust the proof of [13, Theorem 8.8] to find a constant $C > 0$ so that the estimate (3.35) holds.

For a fixed $t \in (0, L]$, define

$$\Omega_t = \Omega \cap \{0 < x_1 < t\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_t = \{t\} \times (-1, 1).$$

For each $k = 1, \cdots, n$, multiplying (3.13) by $\mathcal{K}\vartheta_k'$, summing the associated expression for $k = 1, \cdots, n$, and integrating the summation with respect to x_1 over the interval $(0, t)$ yield

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega_t} \big(a_{11}\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n + (\bar{a}_1 - 2\partial_{x_2}a_{12})\partial_{x_1}\psi_n\big)\mathcal{K}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n d\mathrm{x} \\
&\quad - \int_{\Omega_t} (\partial_{x_2}\psi_n + 2a_{12}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)\mathcal{K}\partial_{x_1x_2}\psi_n \, d\mathrm{x} \\
&= \int_{\Omega_t} f_1\mathcal{K}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n - (\bar{b}_1\partial_{x_1}\Psi_n + \bar{b}_2\Psi_n)\mathcal{K}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n \, d\mathrm{x}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

By the choice of N in (3.24), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{LHS of (3.38)} \geq 2^{N-1} &\int_{-1}^{1} \left(\frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{u_0^{\gamma+1}}{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}} - 1\right)\partial_{x_1}\psi_n^2 + \partial_{x_2}\psi_n^2\right)(t, x_2)\, dx_2 \\
&+ \int_{\Omega_t} \mu_1 \left(1 + \frac{N}{2(L+2)}\right)\mathcal{K}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n^2 + \frac{N}{2(L+2)}\mathcal{K}\partial_{x_2}\psi_n^2 \, d\mathrm{x}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.39}$$

Using Hölder inequality yields

$$|\text{RHS of (3.38)}| \leq C\left(\int_{\Omega_t} \mathcal{K}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n^2 \, d\mathrm{x}\right)^{1/2}\left(\int_{\Omega_t} \mathcal{K}(f_1^2 + \Psi_n^2 + \partial_{x_1}\Psi_n^2) \, d\mathrm{x}\right)^{1/2}.$$

Combining this with (3.39) gives

$$\int_{-1}^{1} |\nabla\psi_n|^2(t, x_2)\, dx_2 \leq C\int_{\Omega} f_1^2 + \Psi_n^2 + |\nabla\Psi_n|^2 \, d\mathrm{x}.$$

In order to get H^2 estimate of ψ_n, we differentiate (3.13) with respect to x_1, and multiply the associated expression by $\vartheta_k''(x_1)$, sum them up for $k = 1$ to n, and integrate the summation with respect to x_1 over the interval $(0, t)$ to get

$$\mathcal{I}_1^{(2)} = \int_{\Omega_t} \partial_{x_1} f_1 \partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n \, d\mathrm{x} - \int_{\Omega_t} \partial_{x_1}(\bar{b}_1\partial_{x_1}\Psi_n + \bar{b}_2\Psi_n)\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n \, d\mathrm{x} \tag{3.40}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_1^{(2)} := &\int_{\Omega_t} \partial_{x_1}(a_{11}\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n + (\bar{a}_1 - 2\partial_{x_2}a_{12})\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n \, d\mathrm{x} \\
&- \int_{\Omega_t} \partial_{x_1}(\partial_{x_2}\psi_n + 2a_{12}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n)\partial_{x_1x_1x_2}\psi_n \, d\mathrm{x}.
\end{aligned}$$

Integration by parts and using (3.9) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_1^{(2)} = &\int_{\Omega_t} (\bar{a}_1 + \frac{\partial_{x_1}a_{11}}{2} - 2\partial_{x_2}a_{12})(\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n)^2 + \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{a_{11}}{2}(\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n)^2(t, x_2)\, dx_2 \\
&- \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{a_{11}}{2}(\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n)^2(0, x_2)\, dx_2 + \int_{\Omega_t} (\partial_{x_1}\bar{a}_1 - 2\partial_{x_1x_2}a_{12})\partial_{x_1}\psi_n\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n \, d\mathrm{x}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+2\int_{\Omega_t}(\partial_{x_1x_2}a_{12}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n+\partial_{x_1}a_{12}\partial_{x_1x_2}\psi_n)\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n\,d\mathrm{x}$$
$$-\frac{1}{2}\int_{-1}^{1}(\partial_{x_1x_2}\psi_n)^2(t,x_2)\,dx_2+\int_{\Omega_t}\partial_{x_2}a_{12}(\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n)^2\,d\mathrm{x}.$$

Hence we have

$$\mathcal{I}_1^{(2)}=\frac{1}{2}\int_{-1}^{1}(a_{11}(\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n)^2-(\partial_{x_1x_2}\psi_n)^2)(t,x_2)\,dx_2+\int_{\Omega_t}(\bar{a}_1+\frac{\partial_{x_1}a_{11}}{2}-\partial_{x_2}a_{12})(\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n)^2\,d\mathrm{x}$$
$$+\int_{\Omega_t}(\partial_{x_1}\bar{a}_1\partial_{x_1}\psi_n+2\partial_{x_1}a_{12}\partial_{x_1x_2}\psi_n)\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n\,d\mathrm{x}-\int_{-1}^{1}\frac{a_{11}}{2}(\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n)^2(0,x_2)\,dx_2.$$

By Proposition 1.2, (1.15), (2.30), (3.9) and (3.17), one can adjust $\bar{\delta}>0$ so that if $\max\{\delta,\varepsilon,\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}\le\bar{\delta}$, then it holds that

$$\bar{a}_1+\frac{\partial_{x_1}a_{11}}{2}-\partial_{x_2}a_{12}\le-\mu_0\quad\text{in}\quad\overline{\Omega}$$

for $\mu_0>0$ from (3.17). Furthermore, it follows from (3.13) and (3.15) that one has

$$\int_{-1}^{1}a_{11}(\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n)^2(0,x_2)\,dx_2=\int_{-1}^{1}(f_1-\bar{b}_2\Psi_n)\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n(0,x_2)\,dx_2.$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and trace inequality

$$\int_{-1}^{1}(\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n)^2(0,x_2)\,dx_2\le C(\|f_1\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)}+\|\Psi_n\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)}).$$

Hence there exists a $\bar{\delta}>0$ such that if $\max\{\delta,\varepsilon,\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}\le\bar{\delta}$, then combining (3.40) with Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields that for all $t\in(0,L]$, we have

(3.41)
$$\int_{-1}^{1}\left((\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n)^2+(\partial_{x_1x_2}\psi_n)^2\right)(t,x_2)\,dx_2\le C(\|f_1\|_{H^1(\Omega)}+\|\Psi_n\|_{H^2(\Omega)}+\|\psi_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)})^2$$

To complete H^2 estimate for ψ_n, it remains to estimate L^2 norm of $\partial_{x_2x_2}\psi_n$. Multiplying the equation (3.13) with $\sum_{k=1}^{n}(k-1)\vartheta_k(x)$ yields for all $x_1\in(0,L]$,

(3.42)
$$\begin{aligned}&\langle\partial_{x_2}\psi_n+2a_{12}\partial_{x_1}\psi_n,\partial^3_{x_2}\psi_n\rangle\\&=\langle a_{11}\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n+(\bar{a}_1-2\partial_{x_2}a_{12})\partial_{x_1}\psi_n+(\bar{b}_1\partial_{x_1}\Psi_n+\bar{b}_2\Psi_n)-f_1,\partial_{x_2x_2}\psi_n\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Using (3.15) shows that the equality (3.42) is rewritten as

$$\int_{-1}^{1}(\partial_{x_2x_2}\psi_n)^2(x_1,x_2)\,dx_2$$
$$=\int_{-1}^{1}(a_{11}\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_n+\bar{a}_1\partial_{x_1}\psi_n+2a_{12}\partial_{x_1x_2}\psi_n+\bar{b}_1\partial_{x_1}\Psi_n+\bar{b}_2\Psi_n-f_1)\partial_{x_2x_2}\psi_n(x_1,x_2)\,dx_2.$$

It follows from (3.41), Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and trace inequality that for $x_1 \in (0, L]$, one has

$$\int_{-1}^{1} (\partial_{x_2 x_2} \psi_n)^2(x_1, x_2)\, dx_2 \le C(\|f_1\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\psi_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\Psi_n\|_{H^2(\Omega)})^2. \tag{3.43}$$

Adding (3.41) and (3.43) together, and integrating the sum with respect to x_1 over the interval $(0, L)$ gives (3.36). The proof of the lemma is completed. □

Similarly, a standard elliptic theory yields a priori H^3 estimate of Ψ_n in terms of $\|F_{2,n}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ which can be estimated by $\mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\psi_n\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$ and $\|f_2\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|$. As same as the proof for Lemma 3.7, there exists a constant $C > o$ such that

$$\|\psi_n\|_{H^3(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|\Psi_n\|_{H^3(\Omega)} \le C(\|f_1\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|f_2\|_{H^1(\Omega)}). \tag{3.44}$$

Using the similar argument, we have the following H^4 estimate for (ψ_n, Ψ_n).

Lemma 3.8. *There exists a $\bar{\delta} > 0$ so that if $\max\{\varepsilon, \delta, \sigma_1, \sigma_2\} \le \bar{\delta}$, then (ψ_n, Ψ_n) satisfy*

$$\|\psi_n\|_{H^4(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|\Psi_n\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \le C(\|f_1\|_{H^3(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|f_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)}), \tag{3.45}$$

where the constant $C > 0$ depends only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0).

Propositon 3.4 is now proved with the aid of Proposition 3.5 and Lemmas 3.7–3.8.

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Let $\underline{\mathscr{S}_0^*} > 1$ and $\bar{\delta} > 0$ be from Proposition 3.5 and Lemma 3.8, respectively. It follows from Lemma 3.6 that there exists a unique $(\psi_n, \Psi_n) \in [C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})]^2$ satisfying (3.12)–(3.15) for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and the sequence $\{(\psi_n, \Psi_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is uniformly bounded in $[H^4(\Omega)]^2$.

Furthermore, since $\eta_n'(\pm 1) = 0$, each (ψ_n, Ψ_n) satisfies the compatibility conditions

$$\partial_{x_2}\psi_n = \partial_{x_2}\Psi_n = 0 \qquad \text{on } \overline{\Lambda}.$$

By Sobolev embedding theorem and Lemma 3.8, for any given $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant $\mathcal{C} > 0$ depending only on $(L, m_0, u_0, E_0, \alpha)$ such that

$$\|\psi_n\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|\Psi_n\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})} \le \mathcal{C}\big(\|f_1\|_{H^3(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|f_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)}\big).$$

By Arzelà-Ascoli lemma, there exist $(\psi, \Psi) \in [H^4(\Omega) \cap C^2(\overline{\Omega})]^2$ and a subsequence $\{(\psi_{n_k}, \Psi_{n_k})\}$ of $\{(\psi_n, \Psi_n)\}$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\psi_{n_k}, \Psi_{n_k}) \to (\psi, \Psi) && \text{in } [C^2(\overline{\Omega})]^2 \text{ as } n_k \to \infty, \\ &(\psi_{n_k}, \Psi_{n_k}) \rightharpoonup (\psi, \Psi) && \text{weakly in } [H^4(\Omega)]^2 \text{ as } n_k \to \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{3.46}$$

Since each (ψ_n, Ψ_n) satisfies (3.37), (ψ, Ψ) satisfies the second equations in (3.11). Furthermore, taking limit for the equation (3.13) gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle a_{11}\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi + (\bar{a}_1 - 2\partial_{x_2}a_{12})\partial_{x_1}\psi + (\bar{b}_1\partial_{x_1}\Psi + \bar{b}_2\Psi), \eta_k\rangle\\ &\quad - \langle \partial_{x_2}\psi + 2a_{12}\partial_{x_1}\psi, \partial_{x_2}\eta_k\rangle = \langle f_1, \eta_k\rangle\end{aligned}$$

for all $x_1 \in (0, L)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, one has

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle a_{11}\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi + (\bar{a}_1 - 2\partial_{x_2}a_{12})\partial_{x_1}\psi + (\bar{b}_1\partial_{x_1}\Psi + \bar{b}_2\Psi), \zeta\rangle\\ &\quad - \langle \partial_{x_2}\psi + 2a_{12}\partial_{x_1}\psi, \partial_{x_2}\zeta\rangle = \langle f_1, \zeta\rangle\end{aligned}$$

for all $x_1 \in (0, L)$ and $\zeta \in C^1([-1, 1])$. This implies that (ψ, Ψ) satisfies the first equation in (3.11).

Furthermore, it follows from (3.15) and (3.46) that (ψ, Ψ) satisfies all the boundary conditions in (2.22).

By repeating the proof of Proposition 3.5, we can show that if there are two solutions $(\psi^{(1)}, \Psi^{(1)})$, $(\psi^{(2)}, \Psi^{(2)}) \in [C^2(\overline{\Omega})]^2$ to the boundary value problem of (3.11) and (2.22), then it holds that

$$\|(\psi^{(1)}, \Psi^{(1)}) - (\psi^{(2)}, \Psi^{(2)})\|_{H^1(\Omega)} = 0.$$

This implies the uniqueness and finishes the proof of the proposition. □

4. Stability of irrotational supersonic solutions

In this section, we prove Proposition 2.5.

4.1. **The existence of irrotational solutions.** Let $\bar{\delta}$ and $\underline{\mathscr{L}}_0^*$ be from Proposition 3.2, and suppose that all the conditions stated in Theorem 2.2 hold for $\underline{\mathscr{L}}_0 = \underline{\mathscr{L}}_0^*$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_1^* = \tilde{\sigma}_2^* = \bar{\delta}$. The constants $\tilde{\sigma}_1^*$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_2^*$ may be adjusted later.

For $\delta \le \bar{\delta}$, let $\mathfrak{I}_\delta$ be defined by (3.1). For a fixed $(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\Psi}) \in \mathfrak{I}_\delta$, consider the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases}\mathcal{L}_1^{(\tilde{\psi},\tilde{\Psi})}(\psi, \Psi) = \mathfrak{f}_1(\mathrm{x}, \tilde{\Psi}, \nabla\tilde{\Psi}, \nabla\tilde{\psi})\\ \mathcal{L}_2(\psi, \Psi) = \mathfrak{f}_2(\mathrm{x}, \tilde{\Psi}, \nabla\tilde{\psi})\end{cases} \qquad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \tag{4.1}$$

with boundary conditions (2.22), where $\mathfrak{f}_1(\mathrm{x}, z, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$ and $\mathfrak{f}_2(\mathrm{x}, z, \mathbf{q})$ are defined in (2.32) and (2.38), respectively.

It follows from (2.17), (2.19), (2.25) and (3.1) that

$$\partial_{x_2}\mathfrak{f}_1(\mathrm{x}, \tilde{\Psi}, \nabla\tilde{\Psi}, \nabla\tilde{\psi}) = \partial_{x_2}\mathfrak{f}_2(\mathrm{x}, \tilde{\Psi}, \nabla\tilde{\psi}) = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Lambda. \tag{4.2}$$

By Proposition 1.2, (2.32) and (1.15), one can find a constant $C_{\mathfrak{f}_1} > 0$ such that

$$\|\mathfrak{f}_1(\mathrm{x}, \tilde{\Psi}, \nabla\tilde{\Psi}, \nabla\tilde{\psi})\|_{H^3(\Omega)} \le C_{\mathfrak{f}_1}\left(\tilde{\sigma}_1 + \tilde{\sigma}_2 + \|(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\Psi})\|_{H^4(\Omega)}^2\right).$$

Using Proposition 1.2, (2.17), (2.37) and (2.38) yields that there exists a constant $C_{\mathfrak{f}_2} > 0$ satisfying

$$\|\mathfrak{f}_2(\mathrm{x}, \tilde{\Psi}, \nabla\tilde{\psi})\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C_{\mathfrak{f}_2}\left(\tilde{\sigma}_2 + \mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}(\|(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\Psi})\|_{H^4(\Omega)} + \tilde{\sigma}_1)^2\right).$$

It follows from Proposition 3.2 that the boundary value problem (4.1) and (2.22) has a unique solution $(\psi, \Psi) \in [H^4(\Omega) \cap C^2(\overline{\Omega})]^2$ which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\|\psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|\Psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} &\leq \mathcal{C}\left(\tilde{\sigma}_1 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\tilde{\sigma}_2 + \|(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\Psi})\|^2_{H^4(\Omega)}\right)\\ &\leq \mathcal{C}(\tilde{\sigma}_1 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\tilde{\sigma}_2 + \delta^2).\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Define an iteration mapping $\mathcal{P} : \mathfrak{I}_\delta \to [H^4(\Omega)]^2$ by

$$\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\Psi}) = (\psi, \Psi),$$

where (ψ, Ψ) is the unique solution to (4.1) and (2.22).

Using the slip boundary condition on Λ given in (2.22), differentiating (2.15)-(2.16) with respect to x_2, and using (2.19), (4.2) and Lemma 3.1 yield that

$$\partial^k_{x_2}\psi = \partial^k_{x_2}\Psi = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Lambda \text{ in the sense of trace for } k = 1, 3.$$

Choose

$$\tilde{\sigma}_1' = \min\left\{\bar{\delta}, \frac{\bar{\delta}}{16\mathcal{C}}, \frac{1}{(16\mathcal{C})^2}\right\}, \qquad \tilde{\sigma}_2' = \min\left\{\bar{\delta}, \frac{\bar{\delta}}{16\mathcal{C}\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}}, \frac{1}{\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}(16\mathcal{C})^2}\right\}, \tag{4.4}$$

and

$$\delta = 8\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\sigma}_1 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\tilde{\sigma}_2). \tag{4.5}$$

where $\mathcal{C}$ is the constant from (4.3). By (4.3), if $\tilde{\sigma}_1 \leq \tilde{\sigma}_1'$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_2 \leq \tilde{\sigma}_2'$, then we have

$$\|\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\Psi})\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \leq \mathcal{C}\left(\frac{\tilde{\sigma}_1}{\delta} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\frac{\tilde{\sigma}_2}{\delta} + \delta\right)\delta \leq \frac{3}{4}\delta.$$

For fixed $(\tilde{\sigma}_1, \tilde{\sigma}_2) \in (0, \tilde{\sigma}_1'] \times (0, \sigma_2']$, let $\delta > 0$ be given by (4.5) so that the iteration mapping $\mathcal{P}$ maps $\mathfrak{I}_\delta$ into itself. By Rellich compactness theorem, $\mathfrak{I}_\delta$ is a compact and convex subset of $[H^3(\Omega)]^2$. Suppose that a sequence $\{(\tilde{\psi}_j, \tilde{\Psi}_j)\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset \mathfrak{I}_\delta$ converges to $(\tilde{\psi}_\infty, \tilde{\Psi}_\infty) \in \mathfrak{I}_\delta$ in $[H^3(\Omega)]^2$ as $j \to \infty$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$(\psi_j, \Psi_j) := \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\psi}_j, \tilde{\Psi}_j).$$

Then any subsequence of $\{(\psi_j, \Psi_j)\}$ has its subsequence that converges in $[H^3(\Omega) \cap C^2(\overline{\Omega})]^2$. For simplicity, let $\{(\psi_j, \Psi_j)\}$ denote a convergent subsequence in $[H^3(\Omega) \cap C^2(\overline{\Omega})]^2$, and let $(\psi^\infty, \Psi^\infty)$ be its limit. Then $(\psi^\infty, \Psi^\infty)$ solves (4.1) and (2.22) with $(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\Psi}) = (\tilde{\psi}^\infty, \tilde{\Psi}^\infty)$. It

follows from the uniqueness of solution to (4.1) that $(\psi^\infty, \Psi^\infty) = \mathcal{P}(\tilde{\psi}^\infty, \tilde{\Psi}^\infty)$. This shows that $\mathcal{P} : \mathfrak{I}_\delta \to \mathfrak{I}_\delta$ is continuous in $[H^3(\Omega)]^2$. Therefore, we conclude from Schauder fixed point theorem that $\mathcal{P}$ has a fixed point in $\mathfrak{I}_\delta$. Hence the nonlinear boundary value problem (2.31), (2.36), and (2.22) has a solution $(\psi, \Psi) \in \mathfrak{I}_\delta$. It follows from (4.3) that (ψ, Ψ) satisfies

$$\|\psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|\Psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \le \mathcal{C}(\tilde{\sigma}_1 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\tilde{\sigma}_2) + \mathcal{C}\delta\|(\psi, \Psi)\|^2_{H^4(\Omega)}.$$

Using (4.4) and (4.5) gives $\mathcal{C}\delta \le \frac{1}{16}$, which also yields

$$\|\psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|\Psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \le 2\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\sigma}_1 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\tilde{\sigma}_2). \tag{4.6}$$

4.2. **The uniqueness of a irrotational supersonic solution.** To complete the proof of Proposition 2.5, it remains to prove the uniqueness of a solution to the problem (2.31), (2.36), and (2.22). Let (ψ_1, Ψ_1) and (ψ_2, Ψ_2) be two solutions of this problem. For each $k = 1, 2$, set

$$(a_{11}^{(k)}, a_{12}^{(k)}, \mathfrak{f}_2^{(k)}) := (a_{11}, a_{12}, \mathfrak{f}_2)(\mathrm{x}, \nabla\psi_k, \Psi_k) \text{ and } \mathfrak{f}_1^{(k)} := \mathfrak{f}_1(\mathrm{x}, \Psi_k, \nabla\Psi_k, \nabla\psi_k).$$

Then, $(\check{\psi}, \check{\Psi}) := (\psi_1, \Psi_1) - (\psi_2, \Psi_2)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_1^{(\psi_1, \Psi_1)}(\check{\psi}, \check{\Psi}) = \mathfrak{F}_1 \\ \mathcal{L}_2(\check{\psi}, \check{\Psi}) = \mathfrak{F}_2 \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &(\check{\psi}, \check{\psi}_{x_1}, \check{\Psi}_{x_1}) = (0, 0, 0) \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_0, \\ &\check{\Psi} = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_L, \qquad (\check{\psi}_{x_2}, \check{\Psi}_{x_2}) = (0, 0) \qquad \text{on } \Lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{F}_1 = (\mathfrak{f}_1^{(1)} - \mathfrak{f}_1^{(2)}) - (a_{11}^{(1)} - a_{11}^{(2)})\partial_{x_1x_1}\psi_2 - 2(a_{12}^{(1)} - a_{12}^{(2)})\partial_{x_1x_2}\psi_2 \text{ and } \mathfrak{F}_2 = \mathfrak{f}_2^{(1)} - \mathfrak{f}_2^{(2)}.$$

It follows from (2.29), (2.32), (2.38), and (4.6) that there exists a constant $\mathscr{C}' > 0$ satisfying

$$\|\mathfrak{F}_1\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \mathscr{C}'(\tilde{\sigma}_1 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\tilde{\sigma}_2)\|(\check{\psi}, \check{\Psi})\|_{H^1(\Omega)},$$

$$\|\mathfrak{F}_2\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \mathscr{C}'\mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}(\tilde{\sigma}_1 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\tilde{\sigma}_2)\|(\check{\psi}, \check{\Psi})\|_{H^1(\Omega)}.$$

Then Proposition 3.5 yields a constant $\mathscr{C} > 0$ satisfying

$$\|(\check{\psi}, \check{\Psi})\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \le \mathscr{C}(\tilde{\sigma}_1 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\tilde{\sigma}_2)\|(\check{\psi}, \check{\Psi})\|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \tag{4.7}$$

For the constant $\mathscr{C} > 0$ from (4.7), we choose

$$\tilde{\sigma}_1^* = \min\left\{\tilde{\sigma}_1', \frac{1}{3\mathscr{C}}\right\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{\sigma}_2^* = \min\left\{\tilde{\sigma}_2', \frac{1}{3\mathscr{C}\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}}\right\}.$$

Hence, if $\tilde{\sigma}_1 \le \tilde{\sigma}_1^*$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_2 \le \tilde{\sigma}_2^*$, then the estimate (4.7) implies $(\psi_1, \Psi_1) = (\psi_2, \Psi_2)$. This proves the uniqueness of a solution to the problem (2.31), (2.36), and (2.22) provided that $\tilde{\sigma}_1^*$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_2^*$ are appropriately adjusted. The proof of Proposition 2.5 is completed. □

5. Stability of supersonic solutions with nonzero vorticity

5.1. **Outline of the proof for Theorem 2.1.** As in previous sections, we fix $L > 0$ and $m_0 > 0$, and suppose that $E_0 > \kappa_0$ for some constant $\kappa_0 > 0$. And, assume that $(b_0, u_0, E_0) \in \mathfrak{P}(L, m_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$ for $\mathscr{S}_0 > \underline{\mathscr{L}}_0^*$ with $\underline{\mathscr{L}}_0^*$ from Proposition 3.2. Note that $\underline{\mathscr{L}}_0^*$ is chosen depending only on (L, m_0, κ_0). Finally, φ_0 and Φ_0 are defined by (2.13).

Set

$$\psi := \varphi - \varphi_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi := \Phi - \Phi_0.$$

Suppose that $c^2(\Phi, \nabla\varphi + \nabla^\perp\phi) - (\varphi_{x_2} - \phi_{x_1})^2 > 0$ holds in Ω, where $c(z, \mathbf{q})$ is the function defined in (2.23) and $c(\Phi, \nabla\varphi + \nabla^\perp\phi)$ is the local sound speed of the flow. Define

$$a_{1j}(\mathrm{x}, z, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r}) = A_{1j}(\Phi_0 + z, \nabla\varphi_0 + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}^\perp) \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \tag{5.1}$$

where $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\mathbf{r}^\perp = (r_1^\perp, r_2^\perp) = (r_2, -r_1)$ for $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, r_2)$. Subtracting the first equation in (2.26) from (2.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}_1(\Psi, \psi, \phi) :=& a_{11}(\mathrm{x}, \Psi, \nabla\psi, \nabla\phi)\psi_{x_1x_1} + 2a_{12}(\mathrm{x}, \Psi, \nabla\psi, \nabla\phi)\psi_{x_1x_2} + \psi_{x_2x_2} \\ &+ \bar{a}_1(\mathrm{x})\psi_x + \bar{b}_1(\mathrm{x})\Psi_{x_1} + \bar{b}_2(x)\Psi = f_1(\mathrm{x}, \Psi, \nabla\Psi, \nabla\psi, \nabla\phi, D^2\phi),\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

where $\bar{a}_1, \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2$ are defined in (2.30), and $f_1(\mathrm{x}, \mathscr{S}, \Psi, \nabla\psi, \nabla\phi, \partial^2\phi)$ is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}f_1(\mathrm{x}, \xi, z, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}) =& -Q(x, \Phi_0 + z, \nabla\Phi_0 + \mathbf{p}, \nabla\varphi_0 + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}^\perp) \\ &+ \bar{a}_1(x_1)q_1 + \bar{b}_1(x_1)p_1 + \bar{b}_2(x_1)z + \frac{(\partial_i\varphi_0 + q_i + r_i^\perp)(\partial_j\varphi_0 + q_j + r_j^\perp)}{c^2 - (q_2 + r_2^\perp)^2}w_{ij}^\perp\end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

with Q defined in (2.28) and

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}^\perp = (w_{ij}{}^\perp) = \begin{pmatrix} w_{12} & -w_{11} \\ w_{22} & -w_{21}\end{pmatrix} \quad \text{if} \quad \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} = \begin{pmatrix} w_{11} & w_{12} \\ w_{21} & w_{22}\end{pmatrix}.$$

Next, subtracting the second equation in (2.26) from (2.4) gives

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\psi, \Psi) = f_2(\mathrm{x}, \mathscr{S}, \Psi, \nabla\psi, \nabla\phi) \tag{5.4}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_2$ is defined in (2.36) and $f_2(x, \mathscr{S}, \Psi, \nabla\psi, \nabla\phi)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f_2(\mathrm{x}, \xi, z, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r}) = &\mathcal{H}\left(\xi, \Phi_0(x_1) + z - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\varphi_0(x_1) + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}^\perp|^2\right) \\ &- \mathcal{H}\left(\mathscr{S}_0, \Phi_0(x_1) - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\varphi_0(x_1)|^2\right) - (b(\mathrm{x}) - b_0) - \bar{h}_1(x_1)z + \bar{h}_2(x_1)q_1. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

The equation (2.5) can be written as

$$\Delta\phi = f_3(\mathrm{x}, \mathscr{S}, \mathscr{S}_{x_2}, \Psi, \nabla\psi, \nabla\phi), \tag{5.6}$$

where

$$f_3(\mathrm{x}, \xi, \eta, z, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r}) = -\frac{\eta\mathcal{H}^{\gamma-1}\left(\xi, \Phi_0(x_1) + z - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla\varphi_0(x_1) + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}^\perp|^2\right)}{(\gamma-1)(\bar{u}(x_1) + q_1 + r_1^\perp)}. \tag{5.7}$$

The equation (2.6) can be written as

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}(\mathscr{S}, \Psi, \nabla\psi, \nabla\phi) \cdot \nabla\mathscr{S} = 0, \tag{5.8}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}(\xi, z, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{H}\left(\xi, \Phi_0(x_1) + z - \frac{|\nabla\varphi_0(x_1) + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}^\perp|^2}{2}\right)(\nabla\varphi_0(x_1) + \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{r}^\perp). \tag{5.9}$$

For positive constants δ_1, $\hat{\delta}_1$, δ_2, and δ_3 to be determined later, define iteration sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_1(\delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1) := \{&(\psi, \Psi) \in [H^4(\Omega)]^2 : \ \|\psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \le \delta_1, \ \|\Psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \le \hat{\delta}_1, \\ &\partial_{x_2}^k\psi = \partial_{x_2}^k\Psi = 0 \quad \text{for } k = 1, 3 \text{ on } \Lambda \text{ in trace sense}\}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_2(\delta_2) := \{&\phi \in H^5(\Omega) : \|\phi\|_{H^5(\Omega)} \le \delta_2, \\ &\partial_{x_2}^l\phi = 0 \quad \text{for } l = 0, 2, 4 \text{ on } \Lambda \text{ in trace sense}\}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3) := \{&\mathscr{S} \in H^4(\Omega) : \|\mathscr{S} - \mathscr{S}_0\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \le \delta_3, \\ &\partial_{x_2}^k\mathscr{S} = 0 \quad \text{for } k = 1, 3 \text{ on } \Lambda \text{ in trace sense}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

We first give the outline of the proof for Theorem 2.1 as follows.

Step 1. For a fixed $\tilde{\mathscr{S}} \in \mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3)$, solve the following nonlinear system for (ψ, Ψ, ϕ),

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{N}_1(\tilde{\mathscr{S}}, \Psi, \psi, \phi) = f_1(\mathrm{x}, \tilde{\mathscr{S}}, \Psi, \nabla\psi, \nabla\phi, D^2\phi) \\ \mathcal{L}_2(\psi, \Psi) = f_2(\mathrm{x}, \tilde{\mathscr{S}}, \Psi, \nabla\psi, \nabla\phi) \qquad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ \Delta\phi = f_3(\mathrm{x}, \tilde{\mathscr{S}}, \tilde{\mathscr{S}}_{x_2}, \Psi, \nabla\psi, \nabla\phi) \end{cases} \tag{5.13}$$

with boundary conditions

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(\psi,\psi_{x_1})=(g_2(\Psi),g_1(\Psi,\phi_{x_2})) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_0, \quad \psi_{x_2}=0 \quad \text{on } \Lambda,\\
&\Psi_{x_1}=E_{en}-E_0 \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_0, \quad \Psi_{x_2}=0 \quad \text{on } \Lambda, \quad \Psi=\Phi_{ex}-\Phi_0=:\Psi_{ex} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_L,\\
&\phi_{x_1}=0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_0, \quad \phi=0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega\setminus\Gamma_0,
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.14}
$$

where g_1 and g_2 are defined by

$$
g_1(z,r_2):=u_{en}(\Phi_0+z)-u_0-r_2 \quad \text{and} \quad g_2(z):=\int_{-1}^{x_2}u_{en}(\Phi_0+z)\omega_{en}(s)\,ds. \tag{5.15}
$$

In the next subsection, we show that the problem (5.13)-(5.14) has a unique solution $(\psi,\Psi,\phi)\in\mathcal{K}_1(\delta_1,\hat{\delta}_1)\times\mathcal{K}_2(\delta_2)$ provided that $(\delta_1,\hat{\delta}_1,\delta_2)$ are chosen small. For such a solution (ψ,Ψ,ϕ), the vector field $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}(\tilde{\mathscr{S}},\Psi,\nabla\psi,\nabla\phi)$ becomes a divergence-free vector field by (2.3), and it also satisfies

$$
\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}(\tilde{\mathscr{S}},\Psi,\nabla\psi,\nabla\phi)\cdot\mathbf{n}_w=0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Lambda
$$

for an interior unit normal vector $\mathbf{n}_w$ on Λ.

Step 2. Adjusting the proof of [3, Lemma 3.3] in Section 5.3, we solve the initial value problem for $\mathscr{S}$:

$$
\begin{cases}
\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}(\tilde{\mathscr{S}},\Psi,\nabla\psi,\nabla\phi)\cdot\nabla\mathscr{S}=0 & \text{in } \Omega,\\
\mathscr{S}=\mathscr{S}_{en} & \text{on } \Gamma_0.
\end{cases}
\tag{5.16}
$$

The problem (5.16) is regarded as an initial value problem for $\mathscr{S}$ in the sense that if $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}\cdot(1,0)\geq\varepsilon_0$ in Ω for some positive constant ε_0, then x_1 can be considered as a time-like variable. If we show that the problem (5.16) has a unique solution $\mathscr{S}\in\mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3)$, then an iteration mapping $\mathscr{S}=\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathscr{S}})$ can be defined from $\mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3)$ into itself. Finally, we prove Theorem 2.1 by showing that the mapping $\mathcal{F}$ has a unique fixed point $\mathscr{S}^*$ in $\mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3)$ when choosing δ_3 small.

5.2. **Well-posedness for the boundary value problem** (5.13)–(5.14)**.** Fix $\tilde{\mathscr{S}}\in\mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3)$, and fix $(\tilde{\psi},\tilde{\Psi},\tilde{\phi})\in\mathcal{K}_1(\delta_1,\hat{\delta}_1)\times\mathcal{K}_2(\delta_2)$. Set $\tilde{\mathfrak{U}}:=(\tilde{\mathscr{S}},\tilde{\psi},\tilde{\Psi},\tilde{\phi})$. Let $\tilde{a}_{1j}$, $\tilde{f}_i\in H^3(\Omega)$ ($j=1$, 2, $i=1$, 3), $\tilde{f}_2\in H^2(\Omega)$, $\tilde{g}_1\in H^3(\Gamma_0)$, $\tilde{g}_2\in H^4(\Gamma_0)$ be given by

$$
\tilde{a}_{1j}=a_{1j}(\mathrm{x},\tilde{\Psi},\nabla\tilde{\psi},\nabla\tilde{\phi}),\ \tilde{g}_1=g_1(\tilde{\Psi},\tilde{\phi}_{x_2}),\ \tilde{g}_2=g_2(\tilde{\Psi}),
$$

$$
\tilde{f}_1=f_1(\mathrm{x},\tilde{\mathscr{S}},\tilde{\Psi},\nabla\tilde{\psi},\nabla\tilde{\phi},D^2\tilde{\phi}),\ \tilde{f}_2=f_2(\mathrm{x},\tilde{\mathscr{S}},\tilde{\Psi},\nabla\tilde{\psi},\nabla\tilde{\phi}),\ \tilde{f}_3=f_3(\mathrm{x},\tilde{\mathscr{S}},\tilde{\mathscr{S}}_{x_2},\tilde{\Psi},\nabla\tilde{\psi},\nabla\tilde{\phi}),
$$

for $a_{1j}(j=1,2)$, $f_j(j=1,2,3)$, $g_i(i=1,2)$ defined in (5.1), (5.3), (5.5), (5.7) and (5.15). It follows from Proposition 1.2, (1.7), (5.3), (5.5) that one has the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *There exist constants $\bar{\delta}\in(0,1)$ and $C>0$ depending only on (L,m_0,u_0,E_0) so that if $\max\{\delta_1,\hat{\delta}_1,\delta_2,\delta_3\}\leq\bar{\delta}$, then the following estimates hold:*

(a) $\|(\tilde{a}_{11},\tilde{a}_{12})-(\bar{a}_{11},0)\|_{H^3(\Omega)}\leq C(\delta_1+\hat{\delta}_1+\delta_2+\delta_3)$ *for* $\bar{a}_{11}=a_{11}(\mathrm{x},0,\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0})$;

(b) $\tilde{a}_{11} \le -\frac{1}{2}\left(u_0^2 - \frac{\gamma m_0^{\gamma-1}}{u_0^{\gamma-1}}\right) < 0 \qquad in\ \ \Omega;$

(c) $\|\tilde{f}_1\|_{H^3(\Omega)} \le C(\|\tilde{\psi}\|^2_{H^4(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\Psi}\|^2_{H^4(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\phi}\|_{H^5(\Omega)});$

(d) $\|\tilde{f}_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \le \frac{C}{\mathscr{S}_0^{1/(\gamma-1)}}\left(\|\tilde{\psi}\|^2_{H^4(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\Psi}\|^2_{H^4(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\phi}\|_{H^5(\Omega)} + \|\tilde{\mathscr{S}} - \mathscr{S}_0\|_{H^4(\Omega)}\right)$
$\qquad + \|b - b_0\|_{H^2(\overline{\Omega})};$

(e) $\|\tilde{f}_3\|_{H^3(\Omega)} \le \frac{C}{\mathscr{S}_0}\|\tilde{\mathscr{S}} - \mathscr{S}_0\|_{H^4(\Omega)};$

(c) *if* $\max\{\mathscr{S}_0^{-1}\|\mathscr{S}_{en} - \mathscr{S}_0\|_{C^4([-1,1])},\ \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\|p_{en} - p_0\|_{C^4([-1,1])}\} \le 1$ *holds, then we have*

$$\|\tilde{g}_1\|_{H^3(\Gamma_0)} \le C\left(\sigma_* + \|\tilde{\Psi}\|_{H^4(\Omega)}\right) \quad and \quad \|\tilde{g}_2\|_{H^4(\Gamma_0)} \le C(1+\sigma_*)\|\omega_{en}\|_{C^4([-1,1])},$$

$$where\ \sigma_* := \mathscr{S}_0^{-1}\|\mathscr{S}_{en} - \mathscr{S}_0\|_{C^4([-1,1])} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}\|p_{en} - p_0\|_{C^4([-1,1])} + \mathscr{S}_0\|\omega_{en}\|_{C^4([-1,1])}.$$

Extend the definitions of the functions $(\mathscr{S}_{en}, p_{en}, \omega_{en})$ in (1.30) onto $\overline{\Omega}$ by

$$(\mathscr{S}_{en}, p_{en}, \omega_{en})(\mathrm{x}) := (\mathscr{S}_{en}, p_{en}, \omega_{en})(x_2)$$

so that $(\tilde{g}_1, \tilde{g}_2)$ can be regarded as functions in $H^4(\Omega)$. It follows from (1.33), (5.10) and (5.11) that one has the following lemma on compatibility conditions.

Lemma 5.2 (Compatibility conditions)**.** *The constant $\bar{\delta} > 0$ from Lemma 5.1 can be adjusted depending only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0) so that if $\max\{\delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\} \le \bar{\delta}$ holds, then we have*

$$\partial_{x_2}\tilde{f}_1 = \partial_{x_2}\tilde{f}_2 = \partial_{x_2}^{k-1}\tilde{f}_3 = \partial_{x_2}^k\tilde{g}_1 = \partial_{x_2}^k\tilde{g}_2 = 0 \qquad on\ \Lambda$$

in the sense of trace for $k = 1, 3$.

The standard elliptic PDE theory and Lemma 5.2 yield that the problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\phi = \tilde{f}_3 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \phi_x = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_0, & \phi = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma_0 \end{cases} \tag{5.17}$$

has a unique solution $\phi \in H^5(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$\|\phi\|_{H^5(\Omega)} \le C\|\tilde{f}_3\|_{H^3(\Omega)}, \tag{5.18}$$

where the constant $C > 0$ depends only on L. Furthermore, the solution ϕ satisfies the compatibility conditions

$$\partial_{x_2}^l\phi = 0 \qquad \text{on } \Lambda \text{ for } l = 0, 2, 4 \text{ in the sense of trace.} \tag{5.19}$$

Using Sobolev embedding theorem and (5.19) yields that for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ there exists a constant $C_\alpha > 0$ depending only on (L, α) such that

$$\|\phi\|_{c^{3,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})} \le C_\alpha\|\phi\|_{H^5(\Omega)}.$$

Consider a linear boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_1^{\tilde{\mathfrak{U}}}(\psi,\Psi)=\tilde{a}_{11}\psi_{x_1x_1}+2\tilde{a}_{12}\psi_{x_1x_2}+\psi_{x_2x_2}+\bar{a}_1\psi_{x_1}+\bar{b}_1\Psi_{x_1}+\bar{b}_2\Psi=\tilde{f}_1 \\ \mathcal{L}_2(\psi,\Psi)=\tilde{f}_2 \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{5.20}$$

with boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} &(\psi_{x_1},\psi,\Psi_{x_1})=(\tilde{g}_1,\tilde{g}_2,E_{en}-E_0) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_0, \\ &\psi_{x_2}=\Psi_{x_2}=0 \quad \text{on } \Lambda, \quad \Psi=\Phi_{ex}-\Phi_0=:\Psi_{ex} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_L. \end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\bar{\delta}>0$ be from Lemma 5.2. There exist $\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^\flat>1$ and $\bar{\delta}_\flat\in(0,\bar{\delta}]$ so that if $\mathscr{S}_0\geq\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^\flat$ and if $\max\{\delta_1,\hat{\delta}_1,\delta_2,\delta_3\}\leq\bar{\delta}_\flat$, then the linear boundary value problem (5.20)-(5.21) has a unique solution $(\psi,\Psi)\in[H^4(\Omega)]^2$. Furthermore, the solution (ψ,Ψ) satisfies the following properties:*

(a) *there exists a constant $C>0$ depending only on (L,m_0,u_0,E_0) such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)}+\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|\Psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C\left((\|\tilde{f}_1\|_{H^3(\Omega)}+\|\tilde{g}_1\|_{H^3(\Gamma_0)}+\|\tilde{g}_2\|_{H^4(\Gamma_0)}+\sigma_2)+\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}(\|\tilde{f}_2\|_{H^2(\Omega)}+\sigma_2)\right); \end{aligned} \tag{5.22}$$

(b) $\partial_{x_2}^k\psi=\partial_{x_2}^k\Psi=0$ *on Λ in the sense of trace for $k=1,3$;*

(c) *for any $\alpha\in(0,1)$, there exists a constant $\mathcal{C}_\alpha>0$ depending only on (L,α) so that*

$$\|\psi\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})}\leq\mathcal{C}_\alpha\|\psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|\Psi\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})}\leq\mathcal{C}_\alpha\|\Psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. By (5.1), (5.10)–(5.12), $\tilde{a}_{11}$ and $\tilde{a}_{12}$ satisfy the compatibility conditions $\partial_{x_2}\tilde{a}_{11}=\tilde{a}_{12}=0$ on Λ. Using Lemma 5.2 and adjusting the proof of Proposition 3.2 yield that there are constants $\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^\flat>1$ and $\bar{\delta}_\flat\in(0,\bar{\delta}]$ depending only on (L,m_0,u_0,E_0) so that the linear boundary value problem (5.20)-(5.21) is uniquely solvable in $[H^4(\Omega)]^2$ whenever $\mathscr{S}_0\geq\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^\flat$ and $\max\{\delta_1,\hat{\delta}_1,\delta_2,\delta_3\}\leq\bar{\delta}_\flat$. As an analogy of (3.7), one can obtain the estimate (5.22).

The assertion (b) can be easily checked from differentiating the equations (5.20) with respect to x_2. The estimate in (c) is a direct consequence of Lemma 5.2 and Sobolev embedding theorem. □

Proposition 5.4. *There exists a constant $\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^\sharp>1$ depending only on (L,m_0,u_0,E_0) such that if $\mathscr{S}_0\geq\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^\sharp$, one can choose two positive constants $\bar{\sigma}_1$ and $\bar{\sigma}_2$ so that if $\sigma_1\leq\bar{\sigma}_1$ and $\sigma_2\leq\bar{\sigma}_2$ for σ_1 and σ_2 given by (1.34), then positive constants $(\delta_1,\hat{\delta}_1,\delta_2,\delta_3)$ can be determined depending on $(L,m_0,u_0,E_0,\mathscr{S}_0)$ such that, for any given $\tilde{\mathscr{S}}\in\mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3)$, the nonlinear boundary value problem (5.13)-(5.14) for (ψ,ϕ,Ψ) has a unique solution in $\mathcal{K}_1(\delta_1,\hat{\delta}_1)\times\mathcal{K}_2(\delta_2)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.3, if $\mathscr{S}_0 \geq \underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^\flat$ and $\max\{\delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\} \leq \bar{\delta}_\flat$, then for any $(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\Psi}, \tilde{\phi}) \in \mathcal{K}_1(\delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1) \times \mathcal{K}_2(\delta_2)$, there exists a unique solution $(\psi, \Psi, \phi) \in [H^4(\Omega)]^2 \times H^5(\Omega)$ to the linear boundary value problem (5.17), and (5.20)-(5.21). If we define $\mathcal{P}_{\mathscr{F}}(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\Psi}, \tilde{\phi}) = (\psi, \Psi, \phi)$, then it is a mapping from $\mathcal{K}_1(\delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1) \times \mathcal{K}_2(\delta_2)$ to $[H^4(\Omega)]^2 \times H^5(\Omega)$. Next, we choose constants $\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^* \in [\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^\flat, \infty)$, $\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2$, and choose the constants $(\delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1, \delta_2, \delta_3)$ from (5.10)–(5.12) so that if $\mathscr{S}_0 \geq \underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^*$, $\sigma_1 \leq \bar{\sigma}_1$, and $\sigma_2 \leq \bar{\sigma}_2$, then $\mathcal{P}_{\mathscr{F}}$ maps $\mathcal{K}_1(\delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1) \times \mathcal{K}_2(\delta_2)$ into itself.

By (5.18) and Lemma 5.1(e), one can find a constant $\mathcal{C}_1 > 0$ so that the solution ϕ of the problem (5.17) satisfies

$$\|\phi\|_{H^5(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\mathcal{C}_1}{\mathscr{S}_0} \delta_3. \tag{5.23}$$

For $\delta_3 > 0$ to be determined later, choose δ_2 and $\hat{\delta}_1$ as

$$\delta_2 = \delta_3 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\delta}_1 = \mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \delta_1. \tag{5.24}$$

If $\mathscr{S}_0 \geq \frac{4}{3}\mathcal{C}_1$, then the estimate (5.23) and the compatibility conditions (5.19) imply that $\phi \in \mathcal{K}_2(\delta_2)$. Therefore, it follows from (5.22) and Lemma 5.1(b), (c) that we have

$$\|\psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \leq \zeta_0, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|\Psi\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \leq \mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \zeta_0,$$

where

$$\zeta_0 = \delta_1 \mathcal{C}_2 \left(\delta_1 + \frac{\delta_3}{\delta_1} + \mathscr{S}_0^{-\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} + \frac{(\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{\gamma-1}} + \mathscr{S}_0)\sigma_1 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \sigma_2}{\delta_1} \right)$$

for a constant $\mathcal{C}_2 > 0$.

Let $\mathscr{S}_0$ satisfy

$$\mathscr{S}_0 \geq \mathscr{S}_0^{**} = \max\left\{ \frac{4}{3}\mathcal{C}_1, (5\mathcal{C}_2)^{2(\gamma-1)}, \underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^\flat \right\}$$

and choose

$$\delta_1 = \min\left\{ \frac{1}{5\mathcal{C}_2}, 5\mathcal{C}_2\big((\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} + \mathscr{S}_0)\bar{\sigma}_1 + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \bar{\sigma}_2\big) \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_3 = \frac{\delta_1}{5\mathcal{C}_2}. \tag{5.25}$$

Under such choices of $(\mathscr{S}_0, \delta_1, \delta_3)$, if $\sigma_1 \leq \bar{\sigma}_1$ and $\sigma_2 \leq \bar{\sigma}_2$, then we get $\zeta_0 \leq \frac{4}{5}\delta_1$, and this implies $(\psi, \Psi) \in \mathcal{K}_1(\delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1)$.

For $(\delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1, \delta_2, \delta_3)$ chosen by (5.24) and (5.25), Lemmas 5.1–5.3 hold, and the iteration mapping $\mathcal{P}_{\mathscr{S}}$ maps $\mathcal{K}_1(\delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1) \times \mathcal{K}_2(\delta_2)$ into itself provided that we choose

$$\bar{\sigma}_1 = \min\left\{ \frac{\bar{\delta}_\flat}{2(5\mathcal{C}_2+1)(\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} + \mathscr{S}_0)}, 1 \right\}, \quad \bar{\sigma}_2 = \min\left\{ \frac{\bar{\delta}_\flat}{2(5\mathcal{C}_2+1)\mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}}, 1 \right\}. \tag{5.26}$$

It follows from Rellich compactness theorem and Schauder fixed point theorem that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathscr{S}}$ has a fixed point $(\psi_*, \Psi_*, \phi_*) \in \mathcal{K}_1(\delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1) \times \mathcal{K}_2(\delta_2)$ which solves the nonlinear boundary value problem (5.13)-(5.14) as long as $\mathscr{S}_0 \geq \underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^*$, $\sigma_1 \leq \bar{\sigma}_1$, and $\sigma_2 \leq \bar{\sigma}_2$,.

It remains to prove the uniqueness of a solution to the problem (5.13)-(5.14). Suppose that (ψ_1, Ψ_1, ϕ_1) and (ψ_2, Ψ_2, ϕ_2) are two solutions to (5.13)-(5.14), and set

$$(\bar{\psi}, \bar{\Psi}, \bar{\phi}) := (\psi_1, \Psi_1, \phi_1) - (\psi_2, \Psi_2, \phi_2).$$

A lengthy but straightforward computation using (5.2)–(5.7) and (5.13)–(5.14) shows that

$$\|\bar{\psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \|\bar{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq \mathcal{C}_3 \left(\|\bar{\phi}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \delta_1 \|\bar{\psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\bar{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \right), \tag{5.27}$$

$$\|\bar{\phi}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{\mathcal{C}_3}{\mathscr{S}_0} \bar{\sigma}_2 \left(\|\bar{\phi}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|\bar{\psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\bar{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \right) \tag{5.28}$$

for a constant $\mathcal{C}_3 > 0$.

Finally, set

$$\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^* = \max \left\{ \underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^\flat,\ \frac{4}{3}\mathcal{C}_1,\ (5\mathcal{C}_2)^{2(\gamma-1)},\ 4\mathcal{C}_3,\ (4\mathcal{C}_3)^{2(\gamma-1)} \right\}.$$

For each $\mathscr{S}_0 \geq \underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^*$, we reduce $\bar{\sigma}_1$ and $\bar{\sigma}_2$ given in (5.26) further depending on $(L, m_0, u_0, E_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$ so that the estimates (5.27) and (5.28) yield

$$\|\bar{\psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\bar{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\bar{\phi}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq 0.$$

This implies that $\bar{\psi} = \bar{\Psi} = \bar{\phi} = 0$ in Ω and finishes the proof of the proposition. □

5.3. **Proof of Theorem 2.1.** Fix $\mathscr{S}_0 \in [\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^\sharp, \infty)$ where the constant $\mathscr{S}_0^\sharp > 1$ is from Proposition 5.4. Let $(\bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2, \delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1, \delta_2, \delta_3)$ be the constants chosen in the proof of Proposition 5.4. For each $\tilde{\mathscr{S}} \in \mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3)$, let $(\psi, \Psi, \phi) \in \mathcal{K}_1(\delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1) \times \mathcal{K}_2(\delta_2)$ be the unique solution to the nonlinear boundary value problem (5.13)–(5.14) associated with $\tilde{\mathscr{S}}$. For such (ψ, Ψ, ϕ), let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = (V_1, V_2)$ be defined in (5.9). Then $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}$ satisfies

$$\mathrm{div}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} = 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega, \qquad V_2 = 0 \quad \text{on } \Lambda.$$

Furthermore, there exists a constant $\mathcal{C}_4 > 0$ such that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}} - (m_0, 0)\|_{H^3(\Omega)} \leq \mathcal{C}_4 \delta_1. \tag{5.29}$$

One can reduce $\bar{\sigma}_1$ and $\bar{\sigma}_2$ so that combining (5.29) with (5.25) yields

$$V_1 \geq \frac{1}{2} m_0 \quad \text{in} \quad \overline{\Omega}.$$

Under such choices of $\bar{\sigma}_1$ and $\bar{\sigma}_2$, one can follow and adjust the proof of [3, Lemma 3.3] to show that the initial value problem (5.16) has a unique solution $\mathscr{S} \in H^4(\Omega)$. Furthermore,

this solution can be expressed as

$$\mathscr{S}(\mathrm{x}) = \mathscr{S}_{en} \circ \mathscr{L}(\mathrm{x}) \tag{5.30}$$

where $\mathscr{L} : \overline{\Omega} \to [-1, 1]$ satisfies

$$\nabla \mathscr{L}(\mathrm{x}) = -\frac{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{V}}^{\perp}(\mathrm{x})}{\mathrm{V}_1(0, \mathscr{L}(\mathrm{x}))} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega.$$

It follows from (5.29) and (5.30) that we have

$$\|\mathscr{S} - \mathscr{S}_0\|_{H^4(\Omega)} \leq C\sigma_2. \tag{5.31}$$

The definitions of $\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^{\sharp}$ and $\bar{\sigma}_2$ can be adjusted depending only on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0) so that (5.31) implies that $\mathscr{S} \in \mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3)$. Furthermore, it follows from (5.30) that $\mathscr{S}$ satisfies the compatibility condition $\partial_{x_2}^k \mathscr{S} = 0$ for $k = 1, 3$ on Λ. Then, an iteration mapping $\mathscr{S} = \mathcal{F}(\tilde{\mathscr{S}})$ maps $\mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3)$ into itself. Following the idea from [3, Section 4.2], it can be directly checked that $\mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3)$ is a compact and convex subset of $H^3(\Omega)$, and $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3) \to \mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3)$ is continuous in $H^3(\Omega)$. Therefore, the Schauder fixed point theorem implies that $\mathcal{F}$ has a fixed point $\mathscr{S}_* \in \mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3)$. For such $\mathscr{S}_*$, let $(\psi_*, \Psi_*, \phi_*) \in \mathcal{K}_1(\delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1) \times \mathcal{K}_2(\delta_2)$ be the unique fixed point of the iteration mapping $\mathcal{P}_{\mathscr{S}_*}$ defined in the proof of Proposition 5.4. Then, $(\psi_*, \Psi_*, \phi_*, \mathscr{S}_*)$ solve the nonlinear boundary value problem (5.2), (5.4), (5.6), (5.8) in Ω with the boundary conditions (2.9)–(2.12).

Suppose that the nonlinear boundary value problem stated above has two solutions $(\psi_1, \Psi_1, \phi_1, \mathscr{S}_1)$ and $(\psi_2, \Psi_2, \phi_2, \mathscr{S}_2)$ in $\mathcal{K}_1(\delta_1, \hat{\delta}_1) \times \mathcal{K}_2(\delta_2) \times \mathcal{K}_3(\delta_3)$. To simplify notations, let us set

$$(\hat{\psi}, \hat{\Psi}, \hat{\phi}, \hat{\mathscr{S}}) := (\psi_1, \Psi_1, \phi_1, \mathscr{S}_1) - (\psi_2, \Psi_2, \phi_2, \mathscr{S}_2).$$

It follows from (5.27) and (5.28) that one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\hat{\psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}} \|\hat{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ \leq & C(\mathscr{S}_0^{-1} \|\hat{\mathscr{S}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \delta_1 \|\hat{\psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\hat{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\hat{\phi}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}), \end{aligned} \tag{5.32}$$

$$\|\hat{\phi}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\mathscr{S}_0^{-1} \|\hat{\mathscr{S}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \frac{\bar{\sigma}_2}{\mathscr{S}_0} (\|\hat{\psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\hat{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\hat{\phi}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}) \right), \tag{5.33}$$

$$\|\hat{\mathscr{S}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C\bar{\sigma}_2 \left(\mathscr{S}_0^{-1} \|\hat{\mathscr{S}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + (\|\hat{\psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\hat{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\hat{\phi}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}) \right). \tag{5.34}$$

Increase $\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^{\sharp}$ so that whenever $\mathscr{S}_0 \geq \mathscr{S}_0^{\sharp}$, the estimate (5.34) implies

$$\|\hat{\mathscr{S}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C\bar{\sigma}_2 (\|\hat{\psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\hat{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\hat{\phi}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}). \tag{5.35}$$

Substituting (5.35) into (5.33) yields

$$\|\hat{\phi}\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \le C\frac{\bar{\sigma}_2}{\mathscr{S}_0}(\|\hat{\psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\hat{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}). \tag{5.36}$$

This, together with (5.32), gives

$$\|\hat{\psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \mathscr{S}_0^{\frac{1}{2(\gamma-1)}}\|\hat{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \le C\left((\delta_1 + \frac{\bar{\sigma}_2}{\mathscr{S}_0})\|\hat{\psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\hat{\Psi}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\right). \tag{5.37}$$

We can finally choose $\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0 \in [\underline{\mathscr{S}}_0^\sharp, \infty)$ depending on (L, m_0, u_0, E_0), and choose $\bar{\sigma}_1$ and $\bar{\sigma}_2$ depending on $(L, m_0, u_0, E_0, \mathscr{S}_0)$ so that if $\mathscr{S}_0 \ge \underline{\mathscr{S}}_0$, $\sigma_1 \le \bar{\sigma}_1$, and $\sigma_2 \le \bar{\sigma}_2$, then the estimate (5.37) implies that $\hat{\psi} = \hat{\Psi} \equiv 0$ in Ω. This implies $\hat{\phi} = \hat{\mathscr{S}} \equiv 0$ in Ω. The uniqueness of a solution to the nonlinear boundary value problem is proved.

Finally, the estimate (2.14) is obtained from (5.22), (5.18), (5.31), Lemma 5.1, (1.34), and the smallness of δ_1 and the largeness of $\mathscr{S}_0$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.1. □

Acknowledgement. The research of Myoungjean Bae was supported in part by Priority Research Centers Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology(NRF Project no. 2013053914), and it was also supported in part under the framework of international cooperation program managed by National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF-2015K2A2A2002145). The research of Ben Duan was supported in part by NSFC 11501077 and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, grant 3004-852039. The research of Chunjing Xie was supported in part by NSFC grants 11201297, 11422105, and 11511140276, Shanghai Chenguang program, and the Program for Professor of Special Appointment (Eastern Scholar) at Shanghai Institutions of Higher Learning.

References

[1] U. M. Ascher, P. A. Markowich, P. Pietra, and C. Schmeiser, *A phase plane analysis of transonic solutions for the hydrodynamic semiconductor model*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. **1** (1991), no. 3, 347–376.

[2] M. Bae, B. Duan, and C. J. Xie, *Existence and stability of multidimensional steady potential flows for Euler-Poisson equations*, to appear in Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., (DOI) 10.1007/s00205-015-0930-6

[3] M. Bae, B. Duan, and C. J. Xie, *Subsonic solutions for steady Euler-Poisson system in two-dimensional nozzles*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **46** (2014) no. 5, 3455–3480

[4] M. Bae, B. Duan, and C. J. Xie, *Two dimensional subsonic flows with self-gravitation in bounded domain*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., **2**5 (2015), 2721–2747.

[5] M. Bae and M. Feldman, *Transonic shocks in multidimensional divergent nozzles*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. (2011), no. 3, 777–840.

[6] D. P. Chen, R. S. Eisenberg, J. W. Jerome, and C. W. Shu, *A hydrodynamic model of temperature change in open ionic channels*, Biophys J. **69** (1995), 2304-2322.

[7] G. Q. Chen and M. Feldman, *Multidimensional transonic shocks and free boundary problems for nonlinear equations of mixed type*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (2003), no. 3, 461–494.

[8] S. X. Chen and H. R. Yuan, *Transonic shocks in compressible flow passing a duct for three dimensional Euler system*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **187**(2008), no 3, 523–556

[9] P. Degond and P. A. Markowich, *On a one-dimensional steady-state hydrodynamic model for semiconductors*, Appl. Math. Lett. **3** (1990), no. 3, 25–29.

[10] P. Degond and P. A. Markowich, *A steady state potential flow model for semiconductors*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **165** (1993), 87–98.

[11] I. M. Gamba, *Stationary transonic solutions of a one-dimensional hydrodynamic model for semiconductors*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **17** (1992), no. 3-4, 553–577.

[12] I. M. Gamba and C. S. Morawetz, *A viscous approximation for a 2-D steady semiconductor or transonic gas dynamic flow: existence theorem for potential flow*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **49** (1996), no. 10, 999–1049.

[13] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order.* 2nd Ed. Springer-Verlag: Berlin.

[14] Y. Guo, *Smooth irrotational flows in the large to the Euler-Poisson system in* $\mathbb{R}^{3+1}$, Comm. Math. Phys. **195** (1998), no. 2, 249–265.

[15] Y. Guo and W. Strauss, *Stability of semiconductor states with insulating and contact boundary conditions*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **179** (2006), no. 1, 1–30.

[16] Q. Han and F. Lin, *Elliptic partial differential equations.* Courant Institute of Math. Sci., NYU.

[17] F. M. Huang, R. H. Pan, and H. M. Yu, *Large time behavior of Euler-Poisson system for semiconductor*, Sci. China Ser. A **51** (2008), no. 5, 965–972.

[18] H. L. Li, P. Markowich, and M. Mei, *Asymptotic behavior of subsonic entropy solutions of the isentropic Euler-Poisson equations*, Quart. Appl. Math. **60** (2002), no. 4, 773–796.

[19] J. Li, Z. P. Xin, and H. C. Yin, *On transonic shocks in a nozzle with variable end pressures*, Comm. Math. Phys. **291** (2009), no. 1, 111–150.

[20] G. Lieberman, *Mixed boundary value problems for elliptic and parabolic differential equations of second order*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **113**, (1986), 422–440

[21] T. Luo, R. Natalini, and Z. P. Xin, *Large time behavior of the solutions to a hydrodynamic model for semiconductors*, SIAM J. Appl. Math. **59** (1999), no. 3, 810–830.

[22] T. Luo, J. Rauch, C. J. Xie, and Z. P. Xin, *Stability of transonic shock solutions for one-dimensional Euler-Poisson equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **202** (2011), no. 3, 787–827

[23] T. Luo and Z. P. Xin, *Transonic shock solutions for a system of Euler-Poisson equations*, Comm. Math. Sci. **10** (2012), no. 2, 419–462.

[24] P. A. Markowich, *On steady state Euler-Poisson models for semiconductors*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. **42** (1991), no. 3, 389–407.

[25] P. A. Markowich, C. A. Ringhofer, and C. Schmeiser, *Semiconductor equations*, Springer-Verlag, Vienna, 1990.

[26] Y. J. Peng and I. Violet, *Example of supersonic solutions to a steady state Euler-Poisson system*, Appl. Math. Lett. **19** (2006), no. 12, 1335–1340.

[27] M. D. Rosini, *Stability of transonic strong shock waves for the one-dimensional hydrodynamic model for semiconductors*, J. Differential Equations **199** (2004), no. 2, 326–351.

[28] M. D. Rosini, *A phase analysis of transonic solutions for the hydrodynamic semiconductor model*, Quart. Appl. Math. **63** (2005), no. 2, 251–268.

[29] S. K. Weng, *A new formulation for the 3-D Euler equations with an application to subsonic flows in a cylinder*, arXiv:1212.1635.

[30] S. K. Weng, *On steady subsonic flows for Euler-Poisson models*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **46** (2014), no. 1, 757–779.

[31] Z. P. Xin and H. C. Yin, *Transonic shock in a nozzle. I. Two-dimensional case*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **58** (2005), no. 8, 999–1050.

[32] L. M. Yeh, *On a steady state Euler-Poisson model for semiconductors*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **21** (1996), no. 7-8, 1007–1034.

[33] C. Zhu and H. Hattori, *Asymptotic behavior of the solution to a nonisentropic hydrodynamic model of semiconductors*, J. Differential Equations **144** (1998), no. 2, 353–389.

Myoungjean Bae, Department of Mathematics, POSTECH, San 31, Hyojadong, Namgu, Pohang, Gyungbuk, Republic of Korea 37673; Korea Institute for Advanced Study 85 Hoegiro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul 130-722, Republic of Korea

E-mail address: mjbae@postech.ac.kr

B. Duan, School of Mathematical Sciences, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, 116024, China

E-mail address: bduan@dlut.edu.cn

J. Xiao, Department of Mathematics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong

E-mail address: jjxiao@math.cuhk.edu.hk

C. Xie, Department of mathematics, Institute of Natural Sciences, Ministry of Education Key Laboratory of Scientific and Engineering Computing, and SHL-MAC, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, 800 Dongchuan Road, Shanghai, China

E-mail address: cjxie@sjtu.edu.cn